U. S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR
W. B. WILSON, Secretary
CHILDREN'S BUREAU
JULIA C. LATHROP, Chief

ADMINISTRATION
OF THE
FIRST FEDERAL CHILD-LABOR LAW

LEGAL SERIES No. 6
INDUSTRIAL SERIES No. 6
Bureau Publication No. 78

WASHINGTON
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
1921

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR
W. B. WILSON, Secretary
CHILDREN'S BUREAU
JULIA C. LATHROP, Chief

ADMINISTRATION
OF THE
FIRST FEDERAL CHILD-LABOR LAW

LEGAL SERIES No. 6
INDUSTRIAL SERIES No. 6
Bureau Publication No. 78

WASHINGTON
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
1921

CONTENTS.

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
CHILDREN'S BUREAU,
Washington, December 1, 1920.

SIR: I transmit herewith a report of the Administration of the First Federal Child-Labor Law, which was passed in September, 1916, became effective September 1, 1917, and was declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court of the United States nine months after it went into operation.

This report is, then, in the main, the record of the administration for the period of its existence of a statute in effect forbidding throughout the United States the employment in manufacturing establishments of children under 14 years of age and providing the conditions under which children between 14 and 16 might legally be employed. A delay of one year from the date of the passage was allowed before the law went into effect so as to permit ample time for employers affected by the law to make whatever changes in their labor force might be necessary in order to comply with its provisions. By reason of this delay it was also possible for the Government to prepare careful plans for administering the law as equitably and as promptly as possible. The administration was lodged by you in the Children's Bureau, and, as soon as the appropriation became available in 1917 the bureau organized a Child-Labor Division to carry out the provisions of the act. Miss Grace Abbott was appointed director of the new division. She is responsible for the cooperative basis upon which the whole work was founded, the methods of administration, and the clearness and human understanding of the record of the administration of the law.[1]

The importance of this record lies primarily in the fact that it describes the prompt and effective enforcement of the first governmental provision in this country for the protection of working children. Incidentally it is of interest as a description of administrative work carried on by the Children's Bureau, whose previous activities had been solely in the field of research.

Perhaps it is not out of place to suggest that certain important conclusions may be drawn from this report of law enforcement, although they are not directly set forth therein. Among them is plainly indicated the importance of organizing the administration in such a manner as to secure cooperation from State and local offi-

[1] Part I and Sec. I of Part II of this report.

cials and from employers themselves. Complete responsibility for enforcement must of course be borne by the central office; but the recognition of proper State officials as issuing officers and inspectors in approved States gave a wholesome decentralization, stimulated other States to reach a standard which allowed them to issue working certificates and inspect with Government sanction, rendered the central administration more economical and effective, and created a sound working understanding between all those trying in good faith to obey the law and those charged with its administration.

In the records of the 19,696 certificated children in five States where the State laws were so inadequate as to make it necessary for the Children's Bureau to handle directly the inspection of establishments and the issuance of certificates, much material is preserved as to the social conditions of the children. This material was secured, not as social data, but because it was necessary to intelligent enforcement, and its authenticity is the greater for that reason.

Never before have the processes of Federal law administration brought automatically into view the vicious circle of child labor, illiteracy, bodily feebleness, and poverty. And never before have the same processes indicated more clearly how to break the circle. This by-product of administration is in itself a valuable contribution to the improvement of child labor in the United States.

When the Supreme Court handed down its decision against the constitutionality of the child-labor law of 1916, the United States was at the height of war production. The task of enforcing the new provisions for the protection of working children had been performed with success under trying conditions, and it was felt that a misfortune to the children would be caused if the decision of the Supreme Court destroyed all Federal protection. Accordingly the War Labor Policies Board gave instructions that the provisions of the former law as to ages, hours, and working conditions should be incorporated in all war contracts, and the Children's Bureau was asked to make inspections in order to learn how far employers were complying with the terms of their contracts. Certain investigations for the purpose of learning the effect of the decision upon the employment of children were also made under the bureau's general powers. All these inspections and investigations were under the able direction of Miss E. N. Matthews, Assistant Director of the Child-Labor Division, who has also written Section II of Part II of this report.

The staff of the Child-Labor Division was selected with great care under the rules of the Civil Service Commission. In this way several persons were secured who had had previous experience in issuing certificates or in the enforcement of State laws, among them Mr. J. B.

Clinedinst, of Virginia; Miss Ethel Hanks, of Illinois; Miss Caroline Manning, of Minnesota; Miss Cecelia Razovsky, of Missouri; and Miss Mathilde L. Selig, of Maryland.

I can not close without expressing my hearty appreciation of the intelligent and unsparing work of the entire staff in field and office which made possible the results attained.

JULIA C. LATHROP, *Chief.*

Hon. W. B. WILSON,
Secretary of Labor.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE FIRST FEDERAL CHILD-LABOR LAW.

INTRODUCTION.

The Child-Labor Division of the Children's Bureau was organized to administer the United States child-labor act, which became effective September 1, 1917. Approximately nine months later (June 3, 1918) the act was declared unconstitutional, so that the work of the division in this field terminated at that time.[1] Subsequent to June 3, some general inspections and investigations were made by the division under the statutory power of the Children's Bureau to investigate the employment of children. At the request of the War Labor Policies Board and the Department of War, it also undertook to make the inspections necessary to determine whether contractors were observing the clause with reference to the employment of children which was ordered inserted in all Army and other war contracts. An investigation of the employment of children in shipyards was also made by the division at the request of the Industrial Division of the Emergency Fleet Corporation. A report of this work, which extended over less than two years, is here presented in the order in which it was undertaken.

[1] The revenue act of 1918, Title XII, provides for a tax of 10 per cent on the net profits of any mine or quarry in which children under 16 are employed or permitted to work, and of any mill, cannery, factory, workshop, or manufacturing establishment in which children under 14 are employed or children between 14 and 16 are employed more than eight hours a day, or six days a week, or before 6 a. m., or after 7 p. m. A Child-Labor Tax Board composed of the Secretary of the Treasury, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, and the Secretary of Labor make the rules and regulations with reference to the issuance of Federal certificates of age and the acceptance of State certificates for the purposes of this act; it provides for inspection by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue or persons authorized by him, or upon the request of the commissioner by the Secretary of Labor or persons authorized by him. The child-labor tax division which has been organized in the Bureau of Internal Revenue is issuing certificates and will make such inspections as are made. The Secretary of Labor has not been requested to cooperate along the lines the act makes possible.

PART I.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE UNITED STATES CHILD-LABOR ACT OF SEPTEMBER 1, 1916.

The first United States child-labor act prohibited the shipment in interstate or foreign commerce of the products of (1) a mine or quarry in which, within 30 days prior to the removal of said products therefrom, children under 16 years of age had been employed or permitted to work; and (2) of a mill, cannery, factory, workshop, or manufacturing establishment in which, within 30 days prior to the removal of the products therefrom, children under 14 years of age had been employed, or children between 14 and 16 years of age had been employed, or permitted to work more than eight hours a day, or six days a week, or before 6 a. m., or after 7 p. m.[1]

Before the passage of the bill, it was the subject of much discussion in Congress and throughout the country. In the presidential campaign which followed its enactment its administrative provisions were widely discussed. The measure provoked this general comment because of the desire on the part of a very large part of the public to prevent the premature employment of children, and also because the legislative establishment of a national minimum for the protection of children indicated the beginning of a new national policy. The act had met with opposition which had been organized and led by representatives of southern textile industries. In the summer of 1917, the opposition urged that, as the United States had entered the war, and as the military draft and the demand for ships, munitions, etc., were creating a shortage of labor, the enforcement of the act should be postponed until after the war. But Congress and those immediately responsible for the prosecution of the war took the position which English and French experience indicated, that because of shortage in the supply of raw material, as well as of labor, curtailment of nonessential industries and not "business as usual" must be the rule. Resort to the employment of very young children for long hours was dangerous to the future welfare of the country and clearly not the way to promote sustained maximum production. This position on the part of the Federal Government did much to prevent ill-considered acts on the part of State legislatures and enabled State officials successfully to oppose local demands for relaxation in State laws. While the high cost of living, together with increased oppor-

[1] For text of the act and of the rules and regulations, see Appendix II, pp. 174-181.

tunity for employment, resulted in a much larger number of children leaving elementary and high schools to go to work, many State officials reported that the Federal law had made the enforcement of State laws easier than before the war; so that evidence seemed to indicate that during the winter of 1917-18 there was less rather than more employment of children in violation of State laws than in previous years.

A basis for cooperation between the Federal and State Governments was provided in the act. The Child-Labor Division laid out its plans on the theory that the successful and economical administration of the measure required that this cooperation should be developed into a genuine working relationship.[3]

If a Federal administrative plan is to be developed in connection with legislation in this and related fields, administrative standards in the various States must be carefully studied and certain minimum standards worked out. In connection with the certificates of age provided for in section 5 of the act and in the decisions as to inspections to be made, all the difficulties and the possibilities of State and Federal cooperation were presented, and during the nine months that the act was in effect some valuable experiments were made. Attention is called to these in the discussion which follows.

[3] The Bureau of Chemistry had a similar problem in the administration of the food and drug act, and its experience was utilized by the division.

CERTIFICATES OF AGE.

Plans for the issuance of certificates of age were made on the theory that the successful enforcement of the law depended primarily upon a well-administered certificating system. State experience had demonstrated that only if no child is employed without a certificate, and if no certificate is issued except upon reliable evidence that the child is legally qualified to work, will the age, education, and physical standards of a child-labor law be evenly and uniformly enforced. With a good certificating system, inspection serves as little more than a reenforcement of respect for the certificate by both employer and child. If, however, certificates are issued on inadequate evidence or a careless canvass of the facts, official approval of the employment of children who are below the legal age is sure to be given by the issuing officer. This places a very heavy burden on the inspection department, as under such circumstances the inspector must determine the ages of all children employed, whether with or without certificates.

The United States child labor act of 1916 provided that the power to make rules and regulations for carrying out the provisions of the act be given to a board composed of the Attorney General, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Secretary of Labor;[4] and that this board should decide the conditions under which, and the persons by whom, the Federal certificates should be issued, and what States should be designated as States in which the State work permits or employment certificates should be accepted for the purposes of the Federal act.[5] The board appointed J. Wilmer Latimer, judge of the juvenile court of the District of Columbia, for the Department of Justice; Edwin F. Sweet, Assistant Secretary of Commerce, for the Department of Commerce; and Louis F. Post, Assistant Secretary of Labor, for the Department of Labor, to act as an advisory committee to the board for making and publishing uniform rules and regulations.

From the date of its organization the Children's Bureau had studied the administration of State child-labor laws in the various States, giving detailed attention to methods used in the issuance of work permits. A considerable body of material was therefore available to enable this committee to decide where and under what regulations Federal certificates should be issued.

Unlike State child-labor laws, the Federal act did not penalize the employer covered by the terms of the act if he did not keep on file certificates of age for all children within the prescribed ages in his

[4] United States child-labor act of 1916, sec. 2.
[5] United States child-labor act of 1916, sec. 5.

employ.[6] It did provide that if certificates were procured in good faith by an employer and the children proved to be under the legal age, he was protected against prosecution for shipment of his products in interstate or foreign commerce. Two kinds of certificates would afford this protection under the terms of the Federal act: (1) Those issued by Federal agents under the regulations laid down by the Child-Labor Board; and (2) age, employment or working certificates, or papers issued under State authority in States designated by the board.

DESIGNATION OF STATES UNDER SECTION 5 OF THE ACT.

To avoid the expense and inconvenience to the child, the employer, and the Government of a double certificating system it was important that, so far as the State laws and administrative practices made it possible, State certificates should be accepted for the purposes of the Federal act. In a number of States, radical amendment of the State law was necessary before a reasonably satisfactory certificating system could be assured. As many legislatures were in session in 1917 which would not meet again until 1919, it was felt to be important to call the attention of the States to the advantages of a common State and Federal standard in the issuing of certificates. Before the adoption of the rules and regulations, therefore, a letter was sent to the governors of the various States calling attention to the provisions of the Federal child-labor act and the desire of those charged with its administration to prevent the confusion of a double certificating system. The letter made two alternative suggestions, either of which it was said would lead to the designation of the State by the board. These suggestions were:

First. That the legislatures of the several States consider the advisability of constituting a board of State officials similar to the Federal Child-Labor Board, or of designating an appropriate State official with general power to make rules and regulations respecting proofs of age under the State child-labor laws, in order to secure conformity to the Federal child-labor law and the rules and regulations thereunder; or

Second. If any State does not desire to grant the administrative power recommended above, that its legislature be asked to enact in lieu thereof the following requirements for proof of age which indicate the limit of probable regulatory requirements by the board:

The person authorized by the board to issue the certificate of age shall issue such certificate only upon the application in person of the child desiring employment, accompanied by its parent, guardian, or custodian, and after having received, examined, and approved documentary evidence of age showing that the child is 14 years of age or over, which evidence shall consist of one of the following named proofs of age, duly attested, and the proof accepted shall be specified in the certificate issued to the child; the proof specified in subdivision (*a*) shall be required first, but if this be not available then one of the proofs specified in the succeeding subdivisions shall be required and in the order designated until the age of the child be established, as follows:

[6] The law recently enacted (Mar. 10, 1919) in North Carolina follows the precedent of the Federal act instead of the State laws, using in section 10 substantially the language of section 5 of the Federal act, so that a failure to have a certificate on file is not made in itself a violation of the law as it is in other States.

(*a*) A birth certificate or transcript thereof issued by a registrar of vital statistics or other officer charged with the duty of recording births, which certificate or transcript thereof shall be prima facie evidence of the age of the child.

(*b*) A certificate of baptism or transcript thereof, showing the date of birth and place of baptism of the child.

(*c*) A bona fide record of the date and place of the child's birth kept in the Bible in which the records of the births, marriages, and deaths in the family of the child are preserved; or a certificate of confirmation or other church ceremony at least 1 year old showing the age of the child and date and place of such confirmation or ceremony; or a passport showing the age of the child; or a certificate of arrival in the United States, issued by United States immigration officers and showing the age of the child; or a life insurance policy at least 1 year old showing the age of the child.

(*d*) [7] A certificate signed by two physicians, at least one of whom shall be a public-health officer or public-school medical inspector, stating that they have separately examined the child and that in their opinion the child is at least 14 years of age; such certificate shall show the height and weight of the child, the condition of its teeth, and any other facts concerning its physical development revealed by such examination and upon which their opinion as to its age is based.

The first suggestion—an elastic clause, empowering an administrative board or officer to change requirements as the Federal requirements changed—was little known in State legislation, but precedents for it existed in legislation which had been passed in California,[8] New Jersey,[9] Oklahoma,[10] and Virginia,[11] providing that State standards as to what constitutes adulteration, etc., should follow the standards fixed by the Department of Agriculture in its administration of the Federal pure food law. This suggestion of the board for a flexible law with reference to the proof of age for work permits was adopted in Arkansas,[12] Kansas,[13] and Vermont,[14] in 1917.

---

[7] Amended in rules and regulations adopted by the board.

[8] Acts of 1907, ch. 186, sec. 4, as amended by acts of 1909, ch. 226.

[9] Acts of 1915, ch. 73.

[10] R. L. 1910, sec. 6918 (History: Acts of 1909, p. 279.)

[11] Acts of 1908, ch. 372, sec. 10.

[12] Acts of 1917, act No. 391, sec. 8. "The person authorized to issue an employment certificate shall be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to make and prescribe, and from time to time to change and amend such rules and regulations not in conflict with this act, as he may deem necessary and proper to secure satisfactory evidence of the age of the child: *Provided, however,* That the evidence of the age required under such rules and regulations as to the proof of age prescribed by any rules and regulations and pursuant to the act of Congress entitled, 'An Act to prevent interstate commerce in the products of child labor and for other purposes,' approved September first, nineteen hundred and sixteen."

[13] Acts of 1917, ch. 227, sec. 6. The provision of the Kansas statute is as follows: "The State commissioner of labor shall be, and hereby is authorized, empowered, and directed to make and prescribe, and from time to time to change and amend such rules and regulations, not in conflict with this act, as he may deem necessary and proper to secure satisfactory evidence of the age of the child applying for a work permit: *Provided, however,* That the evidence of age, and the manner of preparing and producing such evidence, required under such rules and regulations, shall comply substantially with the requiremets as to proof of age prescribed by any rules and regulations made pursuant to the act of Congress entitled, 'An act to prevent interstate commerce in the products of child labor, and for other purposes, approved September first, nineteen hundred and sixteen,' and any amendments thereto hereafter made."

[14] Acts of 1917, No. 177, sec. 10. "The commissioner of industries is hereby authorized to make and prescribe, and from time to time to change and amend such rules and regulations, not in conflict with this act as he may deem necessary and proper to secure satisfactory evidence of the age of the child applying for an age certificate: *Provided, however,* That the evidence of age required under such rules and regulations shall at all times comply substantially with the requirements for proof of age prescribed by any rules and regulations made pursuant to the act of Congress entitled, 'An act to prevent interstate commerce in the products of child labor, and for other purposes,' approved September first, nineteen hundred and sixteen."

During the same year, State laws in Illinois and Tennessee were amended so that evidence of age was required substantially as recommended by the board, and the whole system of certificating was much improved.

The regulation finally adopted by the board with reference to designation of States was as follows:

Regulation 3—Authorization of acceptance of State certificates.—States in which the age, employment, or working certificates, permits, or papers are issued under State authority substantially in accord with the requirements of the act and with regulation 2,[15] hereof, may be designated, in accordance with section 5 of the act, as States in which certificates issued under State authority shall have the same force and effect as those issued under the direct authority of this act, except as individual certificates may be suspended or revoked in accordance with regulations 4 and 8. Certificates in States so designated shall have this force and effect for the period of time specified by the board, unless in the judgment of the board the withdrawal of such authorization at an earlier date seems desirable for the effective administration of the act. Certificates requiring conditions or restrictions additional to those required by the Federal act or by the rules and regulations shall not be deemed to be inconsistent with the act.

In accordance with this regulation the following 39 States and the District of Columbia were designated on August 15 by the board, the designation to take effect on September 1, for a six-months period:

Alabama.	Indiana.	Missouri.[16]	Pennsylvania.
Arizona.	Iowa.	Montana.	Rhode Island.
Arkansas.	Kansas.	Nebraska.	Tennessee.
California.	Kentucky.	New Hampshire.	Texas.[17]
Colorado.	Louisiana.	New Jersey.	Utah.
Connecticut.	Maine.	New York.	Vermont.
Delaware.	Maryland.	North Dakota.	Virginia.
Dist. of Columbia.	Massachusetts.	Ohio.	Washington.
Florida.	Michigan.	Oklahoma.	West Virginia.
Illinois.	Minnesota.	Oregon.	Wisconsin.

These States could be roughly classified as follows:

1. Those in which the evidence of age required by the State law and accepted in practice in the issuing of certificates met or exceeded the Federal standards.

2 Those in which satisfactory evidence was required by the statute, but the law was generally disregarded and quite unsatisfactory evidence of age was accepted in practice by the local certificate-issuing officers.

---

[15] Regulation 2 fixed the evidence which must be required as proof of age. For discussion see pp. 22–25.

[16] In Missouri mine operators applied to the chief inspector for certificates for 16-year-old children employed in the mines. He was of the opinion that such certificates could not be issued under the State laws of Missouri, and in consequence the commissioner was authorized to issue Federal certificates for employment in mines and quarries as provided for in the rules and regulations.

[17] Before the expiration of the six-month period, it was found that certificates would have to be issued in Texas, and local superintendents of schools or department of health officials in the principal industrial centers were commissioned for this purpose as Federal officers.

3. Those in which satisfactory evidence was required by the statute, but the statute was variously interpreted and administered in different parts of the State.

4. Those in which the evidence of age required by the State statute did not meet the standards laid down by the Federal act, but discretion was lodged in the administrative officers, so that they could if they so desired raise the local standards.

Letters were sent to the State departments of education and of factory inspection explaining regulations 2 and 3, the apparent difficulties in the local situation, and the basis on which the designation had been made by the board. Through personal visits, conferences with State officials, and local inspections, attempts were made to assist in those adjustments in the State practices which were necessary if the certificating was to be left largely in the hands of State officers and at the same time an approximately uniform enforcement of the Federal law insured. It was recognized that while this could not be accomplished at once, progress toward this end was necessary and possible.

On March 1, 1918, the designation of all these States expired. At this time 13 States—

Connecticut,	Oregon,	New Jersey,
New York,	Rhode Island,	Ohio,
Maryland,	Maine,	Pennsylvania,
Kansas,	Massachusetts,	Wisconsin—
New Hampshire,		

were redesignated for a period of 12 months; and 22 States and the District of Columbia—

Alabama,	Louisiana,	Vermont,
Arkansas,	Minnesota,	Arizona,
Colorado,	Montana,	California,
Dist. of Columbia,	North Dakota,	Delaware,
Illinois,	Tennessee,	Florida,
Iowa,	Washington,	Kentucky,
Michigan,	Missouri,	Nebraska—
Utah,	Oklahoma,	

were redesignated for a period of 6 months.

The redesignation of Virginia and West Virginia was limited to a period of three months.

The evidence of age required by the Virginia law was below the Federal standard, and the certificates were issued by notaries public. The latter were entirely out of touch with schools and had no training for, or interest in, the administering of a child-labor law, except those notaries who were regularly employed by a manufacturing establishment to issue certificates for children employed in the factory. It was to be expected that under such a system results would be entirely unsatisfactory. Investigations and inspections made in Virginia showed that the notaries were making a general practice

of issuing when the only proof of age presented was a parent's affidavit, although documentary evidence required by law was easily obtainable. At the time when the first designation of six months expired (Mar. 1, 1918), legislation was pending which if passed would have made it possible to continue to accept the Virginia certificates. The measure finally adopted required better proof of age, but the issuing of the certificates was still left to the notaries public. It was therefore considered necessary to begin the issuance of Federal certificates in Virginia.

The question of the redesignation of Indiana [18] and West Virginia [19] was pending at the time the law was declared unconstitutional.

As the inspection reports show, States were redesignated for 12 months in which the administrative practices in certain sections of the State were far from satisfactory. The principal difficulty in deciding as to the designation of many of the States was that the certificating was done well in one town and very poorly in another. In a few States—for example, Connecticut, New Hampshire, and Wisconsin—the work was under State control; but in most States the authority to issue certificates was given to the local superintendent of schools. The work requires careful attention to administrative details. This kind of attention, as the inspections made clearly show, will usually not be given by busy school or other local officers unless the value of it is clearly and frequently indicated by State officers. Supervision has been specifically provided for in the statutes of only a very few States. Many of the laws, however, have given to State superintendents or commissioners of education, or to State labor boards, or some similar public authority, the power to prepare the forms to be used by local officers, or required that reports of certificates issued and refused shall be made to the State labor department. Even without a specific grant of supervisory authority, much could be done—and in some States the Federal inspectors found that much was being done—by the State superintendents or factory inspectors to bring the examination of the children for their working papers up to the standard.

The conditions which the inspections in Ohio revealed [20] are typical of a very large proportion of the States. In that State and in a number of others, there were provisions in the law which could have been made the basis for bringing local conditions up to standard. These provisions were the requirement that reports on all certificates should be filed with the department of factory inspection, or that forms, etc., should be prescribed by the State superintendent of education. But in general this power was not used, and local com-

[18] See p. 67.
[19] See p. 81.
[20] See pp. 125-128.

munities had been allowed to continue practices which were in violation of the law.

While absolute uniformity was not necessary and perhaps not desirable, still if the certificates of every city and town in a certain State, or of no city or town in that State, were to be accepted for the purposes of the Federal act, it was essential that at least a certain minimum adminstrative standard should be followed throughout the State.

FEDERAL CERTIFICATES.

Rules and regulations.

The committee appointed by the board to draft rules and regulations [21] devoted much time to the consideration of the rules which should govern the issuance of Federal certificates; and the provisions on this subject in the tentative rules and regulations submitted by the committee were thoroughly discussed both at the public hearing on July 24, which was attended largely by employers or their representatives, and at the conference of State officials on July 27. The points on which some difference of opinion existed were first, whether certificates should be issued to the child or to the employer; second, whether certificates should be issued to children 16 years of age and over, as well as to those between 14 and 16; third, what proofs of age should be accepted. These points are treated in detail in the following sections:

Persons to whom certificates should be issued.—If certificates are issued to employers, a new certificate must be issued for a child every time he changes his job. The inspection service would thus have available at all times complete information as to where children are employed and in what numbers; whether the number of children employed is increasing or decreasing in a particular industry or locality; and how frequently the children are changing employment. It is also of great assistance if attendance at school during unemployment, or at continuation school during employment, is required.

Some State officials at the conference objected to issuing a certificate to the employer on the ground of the additional expense and administrative difficulty entailed in the issuance of a new certificate with each change of employment; and the fear that the employer, by refusing to return the certificate or by threatening that he would not return it, might prevent a child from leaving his employment. State experience showed, however, that the last objection could be met administratively by canceling or taking up all certificates not promptly returned.

After canvassing these advantages and disadvantages, the plan of issuing the certificate to the employer was adopted by the board.

---

[21] See p 15.

Age at which certificates should be issued.—Extending the issuance of certificates to children who are 16 years of age when the law regulates the employment of children only up to 16 is urged in some sections as a means of insuring the observance of that age standard. If the parents of the child say he is 16, the usual practice of the issuing officer is not to issue a certificate but to leave to the employer the responsibility of deciding whether the child is or is not under that age. This means that the inspection service must be relied upon to detect any violations of the law which may occur in this way, and that children who are in fact under 16 may be employed more than the legal number of hours until the annual or semiannual inspections are made. Because of the administrative expense and difficulty involved in issuing to 16-year-old children, the committee decided that Federal certificates should be issued for such children only if employment in mines or quarries was contemplated. During the nine months of issuance the officers and director of the Child-Labor Division were increasingly impressed with the need of issuing certificates for all 16-year-old children.

Proof of age.—While the State laws vary greatly, a careful analysis of the measures adopted from time to time shows that the States are coming to a recognition of the necessity of establishing an educational, a physical, and an age minimum which a child must reach before he is permitted to go to work. If the law establishes an educational standard, the permit-issuing officer must determine whether the child can read and write simple sentences in English or has a fourth, sixth, or eighth grade education, as the law may require. The schools are so standardized that educational qualifications may be fairly easily determined. The physical fitness of a child to undertake a particular kind of employment and the normal physical development of a child of 14, 15, or 16 years of age have not been well standardized, although in a few places excellent work is now being done along this line.[22]

The Federal child-labor act of September 1, 1916, established only an age minimum. Age ought to be a fact which could be quickly and finally established; but as vital statistics have not been kept in a large part of the United States, much time must be spent in the search for proof of age, and in many instances unimpeachable evidence can not be obtained.[23]

---

[22] The imperative need of physical tests for children about to enter employment and of continuous supervision over the health of children at work has received national recognition in the organization by the Children's Bureau of a permanent committee to determine physical standards for working children. The preliminary report of this committee is now in press.

[23] The birth-registration systems of the various States were so unreliable that not until 1915—or about 12 years after the majority of the children considered in this study were born—was it possible for the Bureau of the Census to establish a birth-registration area; that is, an area in which the birth registration was 90 per cent complete. This area at that time included only 10 States and the District of Columbia; it now includes only 23 States and the District of Columbia.

It was urged by many manufacturers at the hearing on the tentative rules and regulations that a parent's or guardian's affidavit should be accepted as satisfactory evidence (1) because it was not possible to secure other evidence in the South and (2) because it is reliable evidence. Statements made by manufacturers that it would be found impossible to secure any of the evidence required under (a), (b), and (c) of regulation 2,[24] were made, it was believed, without any real knowledge of the facts. Experience in many States has proved that the issuance of certificates on the affidavit of the parent tends to result in the defeat of the purpose of the law. If the full responsibility is put on the child's parents, the conviction often becomes general among the parents whose necessities are the greatest that the law requires them to swear that the child is of a certain age before he can get a job. Evidence of the unreliability of the parents' statements was secured in connection with the issuance of Federal certificates of age in South Carolina. The child-labor law of that State provided for the issuance of certificates on the basis of the parent's affidavit. The first 3,858 applications made for Federal certificates were checked with the affidavits previously filed in the office of the commissioner of agriculture, commerce, and labor. This canvass showed that documentary evidence had been presented by the parents to the Federal issuing officers which showed that 81 children were older and 601, or 15.6 per cent of the number checked, were younger than the age previously sworn to by the parents. Those manufacturers who shipped in interstate or foreign commerce, and who felt that the parent's affidavit was the best evidence, were free under the Federal act to accept it, but they were liable to prosecution if in fact it proved unreliable and they employed children contrary to the provisions of the act. Very few of them, however, had sufficient confidence in the parents' affidavits to be willing to take this risk.

The proof of age finally recommended by the committee and adopted by the board was as follows:

Regulation 2—Proof of age.—Persons authorized by the board to issue age certificates under the authority of this act shall issue such certificates only upon the application in person of the child desiring employment, accompanied by its parent, guardian, or custodian; and after having received, examined, and approved documentary evidence of age showing that the child is 14 years of age or over if employment in a mill, cannery, workshop, factory, or manufacturing establishment is contemplated, or that the child is between 16 and 17 years of age if employment in or about a mine or quarry is contemplated; which evidence shall consist of one of the following-named proofs of age, to be required in the order herein designated, as follows:

(*a*) A birth certificate or attested transcript thereof issued by a registrar of vital statistics or other officer charged with the duty of recording births.

(*b*) A record of baptism or a certificate or attested transcript thereof showing the date of birth and place of baptism of the child.

[24] See Appendix II, p. 177

(*c*) A bona fide contemporary record of the date and place of the child's birth kept in the Bible in which the records of the births in the family of the child are preserved, or other documentary evidence satisfactory to the Secretary of Labor or such person as he may designate, such as a passport showing the age of the child, a certificate of arrival in the United States issued by the United States immigration officers and showing the age of the child, or a life insurance policy; provided that such other satisfactory documentary evidence has been in existence at least one year prior to the time it is offered in evidence; and provided further that a school record or a parent's, guardian's, or custodian's affidavit, certificate, or other written statement of age shall not be accepted except as specified in paragraph (*d*).

(*d*) A certificate signed by a public-health physician or a public-school physician, specifying what in the opinion of such physician is the physical age of the child; such certificate shall show the height and weight of the child and other facts concerning its physical development revealed by such examination and upon which the opinion of the physician as to the physical age of the child is based. A parent's, guardian's, or custodian's certificate as to the age of the child and a record of age as given on the register of the school which the child first attended or in the school census, if obtainable, shall be submitted with the physician's certificate showing physical age.

The officer issuing the age certificate for a child shall require the evidence of age specified in subdivision (*a*) in preference to that specified in any subsequent subdivision, and shall not accept the evidence of age permitted by any subsequent subdivision unless he shall receive and file evidence that the evidence of age required by the preceding subdivision or subdivisions can not be obtained.

A birth certificate or a transcript of an official record made at the time of the birth is the best evidence. A record of baptism in a church in which infant baptism is practiced and records are carefully kept is also good proof of age.

The Bible record in which the date and place of birth are recorded at the time of birth is good except that there is no reliable method of ascertaining whether the record is a contemporaneous one or not. As this record is in the possession of the family interested, alterations are frequently made. The practice therefore of accepting the Bible record often leads to fraud and misrepresentation.

Passports for foreign children and certificates of arrival also are frequently found to be unreliable. Because of racial, religious, and political discrimination, many immigrants have found it necessary to use passports of other persons in order to get out of the country. Certificates of arrival are based on the ship's manifest made by the steamship company and, as in the case of the life insurance policy, no proof of age is required. The value of the latter consists in the fact that at the time the age is given there is no temptation to make the child seem older than he is. All this evidence—the passport, the certificate of arrival, or the insurance policy (regulation 2 (*c*))—was made acceptable under the rules and regulations because it was felt that in many cases better proof could not be obtained. In the event that none of these could be secured and that no other documentary evidence approved by the secretary was available, the rules and regulations provided that a certificate of physical age

could be accepted.[25] The extent to which this evidence was accepted is shown in Table A of Appendix I.

Issuance of certificates.

Federal certificates of age were issued first in North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Mississippi, and later in Virginia, because the certificating requirements of their State child-labor laws were far below the standards set by the Federal rules and regulations.

Officers of the Child-Labor Division canvassed employers to explain the regulations and began to examine the evidence of age for children employed in these States a month before the law went into effect. This was done in order that the certificates for children who were 14 or over and were already employed might be issued with as little confusion as possible after the law went into effect on September 1.

The questions as to record keeping and transfers from district to district and State to State had to be worked out. A card system was used for the certificates, and for transcripts of records, doctor's certificates, etc. These were 4 by 6 inches in size and differed from one another in color.[26] Each issuing officer kept at his district headquarters, on what was called an information card, a complete record of each applicant for a certificate. On this card were recorded the city or town and the State in which the application was first made; the color, sex, place, and date of birth; school and grade in school last attended by the applicant; the address of the parent or guardian, the date of the first interview, the signature of the child, and the name of the issuing officer who examined the child. If a certificate was issued, the date of issuance, the evidence of age accepted, the certificate number, the name and address of employer, and the kind of industry were recorded on the information card. Space was provided for entering the time when work began and ended on each certificate, and for recording any action taken, such as suspension or revocation of a certificate. If a certificate was refused, the reason and the kind of evidence submitted were recorded. If a case was continued, a record was made of the reason. Entry was made on the information card of the nature of the evidence accepted and rejected, together with reasons for rejection; and also evidence which the issuing officer believed could be secured by correspondence. A duplicate set of information cards was filed according to district in the main office of the division in Washington. Here also were received, examined, and filed in alphabetical order all the documents relative to each applicant for a certificate.

---

[25] See pp. 31–38 for discussion of this evidence.

[26] A complete set of the forms used in the issuance of Federal certificates is contained in Appendix III.

The administrative difficulties involved in the issuance of certificates were many. In general, the child-employing industries are concentrated in the western parts of North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia; but as the eastern sections were not without such industries, a very large area had to be covered. Many of the mill villages are geographically isolated, and practically all are isolated in their community life; so that it was necessary to arrange for the issuance of certificates in nearly every one of the individual mill villages. During the first two months the requests for certificates were very numerous, because they were desired for all the children between 14 and 16 years of age who had been working before the Federal law went into effect. After this period was over, the States were divided into districts of such size that one issuing officer could visit each industrial community in his district once a month.

In North Carolina, Georgia, and Mississippi, employers, parents, children, and public officials were quite unfamiliar with a State certificating system, and the State child-labor standards were lower in every particular than those established by the Federal act. In North Carolina the State minimum age was 13 for employment in factories, but children of 12 could be employed in what the law called an "apprenticeship" capacity if they had attended school for 4 months in the preceding 12.[27] The length of the legal working day under the State law was the same as for adults—an 11-hour day and a 60-hour week; night work by children under 16 years of age was prohibited in factories between 9 p. m. and 6 a. m. What was more serious, no provision had been made in North Carolina for State enforcement of even these low standards. The State commissioner of labor and printing had no funds for inspection and no legal right of entry if he were given funds.[28]

The Georgia law prohibited the employment of children under 14 in or about factories; but children 12 years of age who were orphans or whose fathers were dead could work on special permits issued on the ground of poverty. Night work in factories was prohibited for children under 14½ years of age. In cotton or woolen mills the hours were limited to 60 per week for both adults and children, but there was no day limitation; in factories other than cotton or woolen mills there was a general "sunrise to sunset" provision for children under 21. The commissioner of labor was charged with the enforcement of the Georgia child-labor law, and duplicates of certificates issued by the school authorities were filed in his office. In 1917 of five employees in the office of the commissioner, one was nominally a factory inspector, but regular inspections were not being made.

[27] The minimum age in North Carolina was raised to 14 in 1919. See p. 112.

[28] Enforcement of the North Carolina child-labor law of 1919 is lodged with the State child-welfare commission. See p. 112.

In Mississippi the age minimum was 12 for boys and 14 for girls in factories and canneries. The latter were not included in the penalty clause of the act and so felt free to violate the law. As they were a most important child-employing industry this left a serious loophole. The hours in the factories and canneries were limited to 8 per day and 48 per week for children under 16; but boys between 14 and 16 employed in cotton and woolen mills were exempted from this and from the night-work prohibition of the law.

In South Carolina the situation was better. The minimum age standard had been recently raised, and certificates were required for all children between 14 and 16 years of age employed in factories. The legal working day and the regulation of night work were substantially the same as in North Carolina. But in South Carolina the enforcement of the law was lodged with the State commissioner of commerce, agriculture, and industries. He had done much to acquaint manufacturers with the provisions of the State law and the Federal act; inspections had been made regularly, and violations of the State law had been prosecuted. In the office of the commissioner there was a complete file of the parents' affidavits on which the State certificates were issued under the then existing State law and under previous laws when the age minimum was lower. These had been filed and checked for discrepancies. They were put at the disposal of the Children's Bureau, and office space as well as other assistance was given by the State commissioner.

Number of children who applied for certificates and for whom certificates were issued and refused.—During what was approximately the nine-month period when certificates of age were issued by the Child-Labor Division, 25,330 children applied for certificates. As Table I shows, certificates were issued for 19,696 of these children and were refused for 2,156 children. The number of refusals can not be taken as a measure of the thoroughness with which the work was done. Under the regulations applications had to be accompanied by a promise of employment The Child-Labor Division explained the requirements as to proof of age to the superintendents and managers of the mills and factories, and in many towns and villages the superintendents carefully canvassed the available evidence before signing the promise of employment. This reduced greatly the number of applicants who would have been classified as refusals. If it becomes known that age will be carefully investigated, children under the legal age will not apply. Furthermore, it will be noted that Table I shows that almost as large as the number refused was the number (2,041) of children whose applications were dropped because evidence was not produced in a three-month period. This number includes, therefore, a very large number of children who had no evidence or evidence which, if produced, would have been so

unsatisfactory as to cause refusals of certificates. The explanations made by the issuing officer at the time of the application convinced the children that they could not hope to obtain certificates; and although they did not withdraw their applications, they did not return. In the number whose applications were dropped there were, of course, some who were of legal working age who changed their minds about desiring to work, and some who removed to States in which Federal certificates were not issued.

TABLE I.—*Children applying for Federal certificates of age and disposition of their applications, Sept. 1, 1917, to June 3, 1918, by States.*

State.	Children applying for certificates.	Disposition of applications.			
		Certificates issued.	Certificates refused.	Applications dropped.	Applications pending June 3, 1918.
Total	25,330	19,696	2,156	2,041	1,437
North Carolina	12,345	9,377	1,097	1,203	668
South Carolina	6,727	5,874	377	340	136
Georgia	3,849	2,897	388	399	165
Virginia	1,935	1,210	228	33	464
Mississippi	474	338	66	66	44

The State in which there was the greatest demand for children was North Carolina, where 12,345 children applied for certificates and 9,377 were granted. This number, however, did not represent so accurately the total number of children actually at work as did the figures for South Carolina and Georgia. It will be remembered that before the law went into effect an injunction was granted in the western judicial district of North Carolina restraining the United States attorney of that district from enforcing the law on the ground of its unconstitutionality. In spite of this fact, certificates were sought by many manufacturers in that district, because they were requested by dealers purchasing their products to give a guaranty that no children under 14 years of age had been employed, or that no children between 14 and 16 had been employed more than 8 hours a day or 6 days a week, or before 6 a. m. or after 7 p. m., within 30 days prior to the removal of the products. Others who did not observe the law desired certificates for children between 14 and 16 so that, in the event that the law was sustained by the Supreme Court, they would know at once which children it would be necessary for them to dismiss and which they would have to put on the eight-hour shift. However, other manufacturers in this district regarded this as an unnecessary precaution and did not apply for certificates for the children under 16 in their employ; therefore, the number of certificates issued in the western district did not adequately represent

the number of children employed in that district. In addition, more serious violations of the law were found in the eastern district, in which inspections were made, than in the other Southern States; so that, all told, the number of children employed in North Carolina was certainly much larger [29] than the 9,377 for whom certificates were issued.

Evidence of age on which certificates were issued.—As was anticipated, the evidence of age procured was poor in character. Certificates of birth could be obtained for only a small number of children who were born in States which had been within the registration area for fourteen or more years, or in the very few towns where local records were kept. Infant baptism was not general, so the main reliance had to be placed on records which were in the possession of the applicants and whose genuineness could not be scientifically determined.

Table A[30] shows that birth certificates were procured for less than 1 per cent of the applicants in the two States in which the largest number of children applied—North Carolina (0.2) and South Carolina (0.3); less than 2 per cent in Georgia (1.4) and Mississippi (1.8); and 6 per cent in Virginia. Baptismal certificates were almost as unusual, except in some sections of Virginia, where an Episcopalian, and in Mississippi, where a Catholic population was able to furnish evidence of infant baptism. In North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia the evidence most commonly accepted was a Bible record. Of the children certificated in Virginia, an insurance policy was accepted for 47.8 per cent; and in Mississippi, a certificate of physical age was accepted for 52.1 per cent. Often the Bibles were excellent records, as all the family births and deaths had been painstakingly entered at the time the event occurred. Sometimes, however, erasures had been so crudely made, the child's birth date so recently entered or so obviously changed, that the unreliability was at once apparent. For example, a North Carolina child presented an old Bible with carefully entered births and deaths. But a place had been cut out where the applicant's birth date should have been entered, and below the entries for the younger brothers and sisters a birth date making her 14 years of age had been entered in ink that was hardly dry. Sometimes the erasures were so incomplete that the original record could be easily read, and the certificate could then be refused on the Bible record. But there were many as to the genuineness of which the issuing officer could

[29] Even were this not so, an increase over 1910 in the number of children between 14 and 16 years of age employed in factories is indicated. The Thirteenth Census of the United States showed 8,475 children 14 to 15 years of age and 6,344 10 to 13 years of age employed in selected occupations in manufacturing and mechanical industries in 1910.—Thirteenth Census of the United States, 1910, Vol. IV, Table VII, pp. 499–500.

[30] Appendix I, p. 165.

find no internal evidence whatever. There were Bibles that bore no date of publication; there were entries in lead pencil; entries so badly written as to be altogether illegible; entries made in many different kinds of writing—"by any neighbor who could write"—and old records which were said to have been copied by these neighbors who could write when the family left the mountains and the old family Bible went to another son or daughter. While many of these stories were undoubtedly true, officers became very suspicious of them after they had established in a few cases that the birth dates had all been made a year earlier. There were Bibles that were "back in the mountains" and off the railroad, and the cases were continued from month to month in the belief that, if the record did, in fact, show the child to be 14, a means of establishing contact with that isolated mountain home would be found.

As Table A[31] shows, a life insurance policy was accepted as proof of age for 28.2 per cent of the children for whom certificates were issued.

Except in Mississippi, the children of the southern industrial districts, like the children of the same districts in the North, are usually insured so that in the event of death a decent burial may be given them, although the parents' work may be slack and savings meager. The insurance policy was not a reliable record. The mothers frequently complained that the policy had been taken out by the father and "he, of course, could only guess at the age." In the case of one boy a certificate was refused on an insurance policy presented by his father which showed him to be 16 years of age. He later moved to North Carolina and came with his mother for a certificate, presenting a Bible record showing him to be 14 years of age. The mother maintained that the error in the insurance policy was due to the father's ignorance of the boy's real age. It is needless to say a certificate was issued on the Bible record. Many southern, as well as northern, industrial workers allow policies to lapse. Again and again, two or three policies which had been taken out and then allowed to lapse were offered as proof of age, and sometimes the age differed on each policy. One old colored woman presented an insurance policy which showed her child to be under 14 years of age. When her attention was called to this fact she said: "Think of that, lady; I gave you the wrong one," and presented another policy showing him to be of legal working age. Issuing officers were requested to secure evidence from the company as to the age of children whose insurance was no longer being carried. Some of the companies furnished these records, but others refused except on the signed application of the parent. While this could always be secured, as the request was made at the instance of the father and mother, it meant one more signature to

[31] Appendix I, p. 165.

be explained. The insurance agents made a practice of accepting the parents' statement of the child's age without proof or, indeed, without detailed inquiry; and the Child-Labor Division found that they were willing to arrange to have the age on the certificate changed on complaint of the parent that it was not accurate. Again and again, having refused a certificate because the insurance policy showed a child to be under 14, the issuing officer was later presented with a "corrected" policy showing the child to be entitled to a certificate. Some shrewd, forward-looking parents were found to be insuring their children's lives in order to have evidence which they hoped at the end of a year would enable the child to go to work before he was 14. Issuing officers in the division became increasingly doubtful as to the value of this evidence and felt that the provision in the rules and regulations that the policy must have been in existence at least one year [32] prior to the time it was offered in evidence was not sufficient to safeguard the child.

The evidence classified in Table A[33] as "other documentary evidence" was of many kinds. Family records kept on an illuminated scroll, on "Golden Gems of Life," or Doré's "Biblical Illustrations," were as convincing as good Bible records; in a few places a physician was found who had so carefully kept a record of the births he had attended that it was deemed reliable evidence; sometimes a record of adoption—in one case of indenture—or other court record was discovered. One officer found a good record kept in the family clock; and another found a coin on which had been carefully engraved the date of the child's birth, the engraving indicating that this might have been done at the time each child was born. Only 24 of the children certificated were reported to be foreign born, so that passports or certificates of arrival were seldom offered as evidence. Altogether, although some of the proof classified under this heading was excellent, much of it was of very doubtful value.

Physician's certificate of physical age.—In the plans made for the certificating it was anticipated that it would be impossible to obtain documentary evidence for many of the children, and that their ages would therefore have to be determined by some other test. A physician's certificate had been relied upon, in the absence of documentary evidence, in Maryland, Massachusetts, New York, Pennsylvania, and a few other States. But in all these the number of children for whom better evidence could not be secured was very much smaller than in the southern textile States. Regulation 2 (*d*), as adopted by the board, provided that—

> A certificate signed by a public-health physician or a public-school physician, specifying what in the opinion of such physician is the physical age of the child;

[32] Appendix II, regulation 2 (c), p. 177.
[33] Appendix I, p. 165.

such certificate shall show the height and weight of the child and other facts concerning its physical development revealed by such examination and upon which the opinion of the physician as to the physical age of the child is based. A parent's, guardian's, or custodian's certificate as to the age of the child, and a record of age as given on the register of the school which the child first attended or in the school census, if obtainable, shall be submitted with the physician's certificate showing physical age.

A physician can not establish by a physical examination the actual chronologic age of a child; but if his examination shows the child to be physically below 14 and evidence to the contrary is lacking, the child ought not to go to work even though the law establishes only an age minimum. A physical examination unsupported by other evidence would mean that well-developed children might go to work long before they were 14 years of age. Regulation 2 of the rules and regulations for carrying out the United States child-labor act therefore specified that a school record, if obtainable, together with a parent's statement, must be submitted with the physician's certificate. The instructions to the issuing officers were that if the school record, the parent's statement, or the physician's certificate gave the child's age as under 14 years, a certificate was to be refused.

The textile mills of the South are generally situated in small mill villages. County public-health officers give only a part of their time to public-health work, and it could not be hoped that much time could be given by them to the examination of the children. Many of the physicians who would make the examinations would necessarily lack the definite experience upon which to base their estimate of the child's age; therefore it seemed wise to adopt some standard test of physical age. Among the facts indicative of age are (1) development of the bones, (2) maturity of the girls and pubescence of the boys, (3) the condition of the teeth, and (4) height and weight. For the first, a radiograph of the bones is necessary, so that this method, which some advocates feel is the most scientific, is impracticable.[34] The second involves an examination which is often objected to. The age at which the molars emerge varies so greatly that the third method is inconclusive. So height and weight were selected as being the simplest and least objectionable test.

With this selected it was necessary in the interest of uniformity to determine on minimum height and weight standards. This proved to be very difficult, as such information as was available indicated variation in height and weight with race, sex, and climatic conditions. Unfortunately, material with reference to southern children was very meager.

[34] Roteh, Thomas Morgan: "Chronologic and Anatomic Age in Early Life," in Journal of the American Medical Association, 1908, Vol. LI, pp. 1197-1203.

An analysis of measurements of 10,043 boys and girls granted employment certificates in New York[35] furnished the largest body of material for any part of the country; but as these figures are confined to applicants for work papers—the more fortunate children who remain at school not being included—these findings may be far below normal. This study was made in order to find a standard which could be used in connection with the physical examination to determine whether a child applying for a certificate is of the normal development of a child of his age and is in sound health, and so entitled to a certificate under the New York law and under the laws of other States which establish a physical as well as an age minimum for children. The relation between height and weight which this study recommended was not so helpful in determining age.

The height and weight of these New York applicants for working papers was apparently higher than that found in the course of other investigations of height and weight of children of the same ages in other parts of the country. They are noticeably higher than those recorded in a study of children in a southern city on the sandy coastal plain.[36] These figures, however, were based on the examination of a very small number and may not be really representative of the coastal plain or of other geographical divisions of the South.

With the information available it was clear that the fixing of a standard for use in the Southern States must be an arbitrary proceeding. The certificate as finally worked out called for a report on height, weight, and other evidence of physical age; evidence of disease—malnutrition, defective teeth or tonsils, tuberculosis, etc.—and the doctor's findings from these facts as to the child's physical age. The certificate provided that "a child must be 56 inches in height and weigh 80 pounds to be certified as having reached the physical age of 14 years, and must be 57 inches in height and weigh 85 pounds to be certified as having reached the physical age of 16 years." On the reverse side of the certificate an exception was made that "when in the opinion of the examining physician the child is 14 or 16 years of age, and after a thorough physical examination the child is found to be in good health and well nourished and all organs are found to be normal, the child may be certified as being 14 or 16 years of age although falling slightly below the standard given on the face of the certificate. But in no case may a child be certified as 14 years of age who is less than 54 inches in height or weighs less than 75 pounds; nor may any child be certified as 16 years of age who is less than 56 inches in height and weighs less than 80 pounds." Issuing

[35] Frankel, Lee K., and Dublin, Louis I.: Heights and Weights of New York City Children 14 to 16 Years of Age: A study of the measurements of boys and girls granted employment certificates. Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., New York, 1916.

[36] Stiles, C. W., and Wheeler, George A.: Heights and Weights of Children. U. S. Public Health Service, Reprint 303.

officers were directed that the instructions on the certificate must be carefully followed in calculating physical age.

These standards were regarded as tentative only. Plans were made to watch very closely the results of the examinations and as soon as practicable to examine a considerable number of southern children with a view to securing a body of evidence by which they could be corrected. The issuing officers reported that they were apparently too low for the white and much too low for the colored children, and the recommendations from the issuing officers for an investigation of the standard increased.[37]

The physician's certificate was at first very popular with parents and mill authorities. In some communities all the children for whom the mills desired certificates had been weighed and measured by the local public-health officer before the issuing officer arrived, and physicians' certificates printed by the mills were handed the issuing officer on her arrival. This was to some extent an evidence of good faith on the part of the superintendent—a desire to show that in the absence of the regularly issued certificate they had endeavored to live up to the rules and regulations. It was, however, an unfortunate approach to the examination of evidence. The impression spread that any child who could pass the physical test could work, and the refusal to issue a certificate until an often necessarily long and tedious canvass for evidence of age had been completed was not understood. As they learned that the applications for certificates for children who could furnish no documentary evidence of age had to be postponed until at least the next monthly visit of the issuing officer, in order that school records might be investigated, the enthusiasm for this particular form of evidence decreased.

Unfortunately, this was for a discouragingly large per cent of the children the only evidence that was obtained. Out of the 19,696 children for whom certificates were issued, the proof of age relied upon for 4,834, or 24. 5 per cent, was the certificate of physical age. Table II shows that for 1,124 this was corroborated by school record and parents' statement and the school record only and for 3,522 by the parents' statement only—a very poor showing as to supporting evidence.

[37] An examination of 2,000 white children between 14 and 16 years of age in the industrial districts of the South has recently been made by the Children's Bureau, and the findings will soon be available.

TABLE II.—*Number and per cent of children for whom Federal certificates of age were issued September 1, 1917, to June 3, 1918, on the basis of certificate of physical age accepted as proof of age with specified supporting evidence, by State.*

State.	Total children issued certificates.	Children issued certificates on the basis of certificate of physical age accepted as proof of age.							
		Total.		Supported by—				Unsupported	
				School record and parents' statement and school record only.[1]		Parents' statement only.			
		Number.	Per cent.	Number.	Per cent.	Number.	Per cent.	Number.	Per cent.
Total	19,696	4,834	24.5	1,124	5.7	3,522	17.9	188	1.0
North Carolina	9,377	2,015	21.5	512	5.8	1,365	14.6	108	1.2
South Carolina	5,874	1,574	26.8	53	.9	1,476	25.1	45	.8
Georgia	2,897	929	32.1	403	13.9	507	17.5	19	.7
Virginia	1,210	140	11.6	83	6.9	55	4.5	2	.2
Mississippi	338	176	52.1	43	12.7	119	35.2	14	4.1

[1] Eighteen certificates were issued on school record only—13 in North Carolina, 1 in Georgia, and 4 in Mississippi.

Officers were more successful in securing school or school-census records in North Carolina and Georgia than in the other States. Regulation 2 (*d*) called for the school first attended. In practice it was found necessary to rely on the earliest record which could be secured, as it was so frequently impossible to learn from either parent or child what had been the school in which the child had started. In running down these records officers sometimes found as many different dates of birth recorded as there were schools attended or school enumerations made. But for many children the same date of birth had been used in reckoning the age until the child applied for work. The fact that these children were able to pass the physical tests of age when so many school records, independently made, indicated they were under 14, was convincing evidence that it was quite unfair to the child to accept the physician's certificate unsupported except by the parent's statement of age. The value of the school record is illustrated by the case of a North Carolina girl. She presented a Bible record which was not contemporaneous, as all the entries appeared to have been written on the same date. This was refused, and the child was sent for a physician's certificate of age. The child's height was 56½ inches, her weight 84½ pounds, and she was certified by the examining physician to be 14 years of age. No school record could be found, and a certificate was therefore issued. In a canvass of the census records for another girl, the records of this girl were uncovered, showing her to be under 14, so the certificate issued was promptly revoked. A number of instances of this sort led to a general search for school records for all these children, with

the result that for a considerable number evidence corroborating the age given was secured, while for others the school records showed a lower age and the certificates issued had to be revoked.

Table II shows that certificates of physical age unsupported except by parents' statement were accepted for 3,522 children for whom Federal certificates of age were issued. There are several explanations of this fact. In many cases no response could be secured to letters of inquiry as to school records. When these schools were in the towns or in the same counties in which industries were located, personal visits were made to schools and to the county superintendent's office to consult the records. Officers made a special effort to get in personal touch with the school officials and to learn from them how the school records could be secured. The officers themselves often spent much time in going through census records and putting them in order so that they would be available for future use. But this was not possible when the schools were rural schools situated in counties at a distance from the industrial districts. During the first months of the work, when communities were unfamiliar with them inquiries which were made and the officers with the field in which they were working, fewer school records were secured. Steady progress was being made in securing a quick return on inquiries and ready access to records when the law was declared unconstitutional.

The certificates refused on the basis of certificates of physical age are perhaps more significant than the number issued. Table B [38] shows that of the 2,156 certificates refused, 967, or 44.9 per cent, were refused on documentary evidence—6 on birth certificates, 34 on baptismal certificates, 255 on Bible records, 636 on life insurance policies, and 36 on other documentary evidence. Four hundred and four of the remaining 1,189 were refused because their physical age was below 14; 413, on the school or school census record of age; and 369, on the parent's or guardian's statement.

Of the 364 children who were refused certificates on a doctor's certificate of physical age, under regulation 2 (*d*),[39] the parent's statement and the school record were reported as corroborating the doctor's findings for only 1 child; for 37 children the school record and parent's statement both gave over 14 as the child's age, and for 294 (80.8 per cent), the parent certified the child was over 14 years of age.

The physical basis for refusals were as follows:

Below height standard	5
Below weight standard	184
Below both height and weight standards	134
Other evidence of physical age	19
Evidence not reported	62
Total	[40] 404

[38] Appendix I, p. 166.

[39] Appendix II, pp. 177 178.

[40] Forty of this number were found to be below weight by the issuing officer. (Their height was not recorded.) Because they would have had to go considerable distances to reach the nearest public-health physician, these children were refused by the issuing officer without being examined by a doctor.

In some cases where a child was certified as under weight, the mother began a course of feeding which she hoped would bring him up to the standard; in a few localities, where the mills operated mill farms, the children were sent to the farm in the hope that they would take on weight. Many of these underweight children had been working in the mills for several years. Some gained quickly when they were taken out of the mill and put on a better diet. With others it was a long hard pull to reach even the low standards which the physical certificate required. Some of them came again and again to report that they had gained a few ounces or a pound. One very small girl was presented on each visit of the issuing officer by a husky looking father, who was always irritated with the officer because his daughter could not gain the necessary pounds.

The question arose as to whether a certificate should be issued for the children who came up to standard weight subsequent to the refusal, and the experiment was tried of authorizing their return to work on a statement of age which would continue in force as long as they were of the standard weight. These children were interviewed and reweighed on each monthly visit. For example, a boy in Georgia who applied for a certificate in September, and for whom documentary evidence could not be procured, was sent to the president of the county board of health for examination. The latter certified that the boy was 59 inches high, weighed 75 pounds, had anemia and hookworm, and that in his judgment his physical age was 13. A certificate was in consequence refused. This refusal was considered a very great hardship because the boy's father was not able to work regularly, and considerable effort was made to secure a reversal of the decision. In October the county physician, "after mature deliberation and consulting his [the boy's] family record as to the date of his birth," certified that the boy was "at least 14 years of age." A physician who had attended him at birth—but who was unable to produce any office records to that effect—sent in an affidavit giving an exact date for the boy's birth which would have made him 14 years of age. Under the rules, however, a certificate could not be granted on this evidence. On December 15, when the boy came up for reexamination, he had gained 7 pounds in weight and had learned to sign his name during the two months he had been in school. He had learned also the effect of some of his habits on his weight. He was allowed to go to work on a statement of age, and on each subsequent visit of the issuing officer he was reweighed and found to be improving in weight and general appearance.

Another issuing officer wrote in February concerning a boy who was refused a certificate because he weighed only 73 pounds, that since November she had been "leading him along toward the hoped-for

80 pounds by a regimen that excluded tobacco in all forms and included regular school attendance." He finally reached 81 pounds and, positively radiant over this achievement, presented himself for a certificate. The issuing officer was about to give him a statement when an insurance policy was discovered which showed him to be under 14. The issuing officer wrote: "The teacher and I hope to keep him in school the rest of the session. I did not have time to see his mother, but am planning to do so on my next visit."

A mill superintendent sent a South Carolina girl, who claimed to be 16 years of age, to the issuing officer to be examined, as she seemed undersized. No documentary evidence of age could be discovered, but as the girl weighed only 73 pounds she was taken out of the mill for two months. By that time her weight had increased to 81 pounds. She was put to work, but on an 8-hour schedule. In five months she weighed 86 pounds. In this case the father was greatly interested in both the mental and physical improvement which the girl made and refused to allow her to work during the hot weather unless she was kept on the 8-hour schedule instead of on the 11-hour schedule, on which she had formerly worked. In all, 25 children who had been refused certificates because they were underweight were allowed to return to work on statements of age, which were valid only so long as their weight was kept up to standard.

The law did not require "normal physical development," and so the correction of defects reported by the doctor could not be required before a certificate was issued as it may under the State law in New York, Chicago, Boston, Philadelphia, and a number of other important industrial centers. Many of the parents to whom the defects were reported by the officer were obviously unable to secure their correction, and there were in most cases no public clinics to which they might be referred, as a matter of course. Though not a part of their official duties, the officers tried to secure for these children the help which they so much needed before they undertook to bear the strain of industrial life. For some children it was possible to secure the assistance of local agencies. In a few communities the mill management assumed responsibility for securing the medical assistance needed; and some, particularly those who had hookworm, the physicians who examined them cared for free of charge.

Industry for which first certificated.—In applying for a certificate each child was required to present an "intention-to-employ" card, signed by the employer or his agent, giving the name of the establishment, the nature of the business or industry, whether or not the products of the establishment were shipped in interstate or foreign commerce, and stating it to be the intention of the signer, upon receipt of the certificate of age, to employ the specified child

in accordance with the child-labor law and the rules and regulations. A post-card notice of the date when the child's employment actually began was attached to the certificate, which was sent to the employer. This notice of the commencement of employment was filled out and returned by him. The facts as to the industries for which the children were first certificated as shown by the intention-to-employ cards, are given in Table F, Appendix I. As this table shows, the greatest demand for children came from the textile industries.

Out of 19,696 children for whom certificates were issued, 17,030, or 86.5 per cent, were first certificated for employment in some textile mill. Of this number 14,501, or 73.6 per cent, were employed in the manufacture of cotton yarns and cotton cloth, while hosiery and other knitting mills absorbed 2,198 children. More than 1,500 of the latter were in North Carolina alone. Virginia, where only 21.9 per cent of the children were in textile mills, was the only State in which there was any real diversity in employment. South Carolina showed the least diversity; 96.6 per cent of its working children went into the mills.

The manufacture of tobacco was second in importance to textiles, but because of the very much smaller number of factories it was of little importance except for a few communities in North Carolina and Virginia. The employment of young children in tobacco factories is generally considered to be physically injurious; and in 13 States children under 16 (and in 1, children under 15) were prohibited either from all work in tobacco factories or from specific occupations, such as assorting, stripping, or manufacturing tobacco.[41] For this reason, the fact that 1,432 children to whom certificates were issued were to be employed in stemmeries and tobacco factories is of special importance. Of these children, 902 were employed in North Carolina and 421 in Virginia. In the latter State the actual numbers, but not the per cent, would probably have been much larger if the decision that the law was unconstitutional had not prevented a complete canvass of the children in Virginia.

Number of jobs the children held.—To those who are engaged in the placement and supervision of juvenile workers, the children who wander from job to job constitute a perplexing group. And yet the jobs the children get are frequently so monotonous and offer so little in the way of advancement that a child with any ambition would insist on trying several before accepting what is too often the fact—that there are no better ones open to him. Then, because of the factory organization, it is too often only by leaving a place that promotions are secured, individual aptitudes discovered, or

[41] Alabama, Arizona, California, Delaware (under 15), Indiana, Kentucky, Maryland, Massachusetts, Nevada, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Utah, Vermont, and Wisconsin. In addition, New Jersey prohibits employment of children under 16 in any occupation causing dust (including tobacco dust) in injurious quantities.

preferences satisfied. It is therefore not easy to say when a change will be advantageous or merely demoralizing.

Among the southern children under consideration there was relatively little wandering from job to job. The records show that 19,503, or 99 per cent, of the 19,696 children who received certificates in Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Mississippi remained in the same industry, and 90.6 per cent in the same job. Of the 1,520 children who had two jobs, 10.3 per cent changed from one industry to another. Of the 292 who had three jobs, all except 32 remained in the same industry, and of these only 1 tried three different industries. Thirty-four children tried four jobs; 4 of these tried two different industries, and 1 tried three. Two children who changed five times remained in the same industry through all the changes.[42] The boys were more restless than the girls. Figures as to the number of jobs held by these children are less significant than in States where there is greater diversity of opportunity. Generally speaking, mill employees live in mill villages and in mill houses, where all the interests revolve around the mill. The houses and general living conditions are very much better in some villages than in others, and movement from place to place is doubtless facilitated by the universality of the textile industry in this part of the country and the consequent identity of jobs that are offered; still, the fact that a change of jobs usually means a change of residence for the southern mill worker necessarily tends to keep down the labor turnover among the adult married workers. The children frequently can not change their jobs unless their fathers and often their mothers change also, and the entire family may have to move to another village if a change is made by any one of them. Thus, of the children who had had two jobs, 42.4 per cent had removed to another village when the change was made; and of the children who had had three jobs, 39.7 per cent had lived in two, and 11.6 per cent in three, different communities.[43] For these reasons the figures as to the number of jobs the children have held can not be compared with those for children who live in cities, where five or six quite different jobs are to be had in as many blocks from home. It should also be remembered that in the case of children for whom Federal certificates were issued, the certificating was for a nine-months period only, and that about one-half of the children held certificates for as long as six months, and about one-seventh for less than one month. Many of the group that held certificates for nine months had worked before, some of them for several years, which accounts for the fact that the number of those who held two jobs was approximately five times as large for the children who

[42] Appendix I, Table D, p. 168.
[43] Appendix I, Table E, p. 168.

had been certificated for nine months as for those who had been certificated only eight months.[44]

Proportion of boys and girls certificated.—According to Table F,[45] the numbers of boys and girls for whom certificates were issued were almost equal—9,996 boys and 9,700 girls. In North Carolina and Mississippi the number of girls was somewhat larger than the number of boys; while in the other States the reverse was true, as the following percentages based upon Table F show:

States.	Boys certificated.	Girls certificated.
North Carolina	49.6	50.4
South Carolina	51.2	48.8
Georgia	51.1	48.9
Virginia	58.0	42.0
Mississippi	46.7	53.3

In North Carolina, Virginia, and Mississippi, the number of girls who entered the textile mills was larger than the number of boys. Tobacco manufacturing absorbed more girls than boys in North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Virginia.

The comparative number of girls and boys for whom certificates were issued in certain other localities, widely scattered geographically and having different industrial characteristics, indicates that the proportion of girls certificated was unusually high in all the States in which Federal certificates were issued except Virginia. In textile towns such as Lowell and Lawrence, Mass.,[46] the boys constituted slightly more than 55 per cent of the entire number, a larger proportion than in North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, or Mississippi. In Lynn, Mass.,[46] where the manufacture of shoes and electrical appliances leads, 72.6 per cent of the children certificated were boys. In Pittsburgh, Pa.,[47] 67.6 per cent, in Kansas City, Mo.,[48] 64.3 per cent, in New Orleans, La.,[49] 58.6 per cent, in Louisville, Ky.,[50] 60.9 per cent, and in Chicago, Ill.,[51] 58.5 per cent of the entire number certifi-

[44] Appendix I, Table C, p. 167.

[45] Appendix I, pp. 169–170.

[46] Unpublished figures for the year July 1, 1917–June 30, 1918, supplied by the Massachusetts State Board of Education. Certificates for children over 14 years of age and under 16.

[47] Compiled from unpublished figures of the Department of Compulsory Attendance, Board of Public Education, Pittsburgh, Pa., for the year Sept. 1, 1917–Aug. 31, 1918. (Certificates for 14- and 15-year-old children only.)

[48] Compiled from unpublished figures of the Attendance Department, Kansas City Board of Education, Kansas City, Mo., for the school year 1917–18. (Certificates for 14- and 15-year-old children only.)

[49] Eleventh Report of the Factories Inspection Department of the Parish of Orleans (La.), for year ending Dec. 31, 1918, p. 8. Includes certificates for children 16 and 17 years of age.

[50] Unpublished Report of the Attendance Department, Board of Education, Louisville, Ky., for the year July 1, 1917, to June 30, 1918. These percentages are based upon statistics for 959 certificates issued to public-school children only. The total number of certificates issued to children between 14 and 16 years of age was 1,487.

[51] Figures for year July 1, 1917–July 1, 1918, supplied by Employment Certificate Bureau and Vocational Guidance Bureau, Chicago Board of Education.

cated during the 1917–18 school year were boys. As 51.2 per cent of the children certificated in South Carolina, 51.1 per cent in Georgia, 49.6 per cent in North Carolina, and 46.7 per cent in Mississippi were boys, there was as compared with the cities enumerated a much larger demand for girls in these States. The succeeding section shows that the girls certificated were better prepared educationally than the boys. From this standpoint the demand in the textile mills and tobacco factories for girls rather than for boys does not seem so serious. However, most mothers hesitate longer about sending girls to work than they do boys—perhaps because they realize that in the long run the physical effects are more dangerous for girls, or because they are more conscious of the moral hazards which the latter face in the change from school to factory—which hazards, though present for their sons also, have not in the past been regarded as so dangerous for boys.

School attendance and ability to read and write.—In order to secure the school record of age it was necessary to inquire as exactly as possible into the school history of each child who applied for a certificate. As it was believed that the school authorities would be interested in securing the return to school of children for whom certificates were refused, information regarding the grade last attended was also secured. The information given by the child was not corroborated by a statement from the teacher or principal, or by any educational test such as would have been necessary if the law had established an educational minimum. Many of the schools were ungraded, and the child frequently reported only "first reader" or "third room." This was interpreted in the tabulation to mean the first, second, or third grade, as the case might be, although this assumed a degree of organization which in many instances did not exist, especially in the country or mountain schools from which some of the children came. The test of ability to write their names was for this reason a more uniform one than the child's report as to the grade he had last attended.

Table III shows that of the children certificated, a small number (188) reported that they had never been to school at all, while 1,615, or 8.2 per cent, had not gone beyond the first grade; more than half the children certificated, or 56.2 per cent, were in or below the fourth grade when they left school; while only 2.7 per cent were in the eighth grade, and 1.3 per cent in the ninth or higher grades.

TABLE III.—*Number and per cent of children for whom Federal certificates of age were issued, September 1, 1917, to June 3, 1918, who had last attended grade specified, by State.*

States.	Total children.	Never attended school.	School grade last attended.									
			First grade.	Second grade.	Third grade.	Fourth grade.	Fifth grade.	Sixth grade.	Seventh grade.	Eighth grade.	Ninth and higher grades.	Not reported.
Total:												
Number	19,696	188	1,615	2,179	3,268	4,008	3,363	2,398	1,509	534	249	385
Per cent	100.0	1.0	8.2	11.1	16.6	20.3	17.1	12.2	7.7	2.7	1.3	2.0
North Carolina:												
Number	9,377	54	750	1,080	1,603	1,977	1,649	1,099	686	235	102	142
Per cent	100.0	0.6	8.0	11.5	17.1	21.1	17.6	11.7	7.3	2.5	1.1	1.5
South Carolina:												
Number	5,874	98	582	713	968	1,166	899	666	401	179	61	141
Per cent	100.0	1.7	9.9	12.1	16.5	19.9	15.3	11.3	6.8	3.0	1.0	2.4
Georgia:												
Number	2,887	23	185	288	515	608	542	359	214	77	35	51
Per cent	100.0	0.8	6.4	9.9	17.8	21.0	18.7	12.4	7.4	2.7	1.2	1.8
Virginia:												
Number	1,210	10	76	66	125	195	212	226	179	31	47	43
Per cent	100.0	0.8	6.3	5.5	10.3	16.1	17.5	18.7	14.8	2.6	3.9	3.6
Mississippi:												
Number	338	3	22	32	57	62	61	48	29	12	4	8
Per cent	100.0	0.9	6.5	9.5	16.9	18.3	18.0	14.2	8.6	3.6	1.2	2.4

In a few States the State child-labor law required the completion of the common school, or the eighth grade, before a child between 14 and 16 could secure a work permit.[52] With such a standard only 337 (3.6 per cent) of the 9,377 children who procured certificates of age in North Carolina, and only 240 (4.1 per cent) of the 5,874 who secured certificates in South Carolina, would have been allowed to leave school for industrial employment.

Comparative figures as to grade last attended are available for very few States. They vary greatly, as the compulsory school-attendance and child-labor laws vary in their requirements. But such material as is available shows that the working children of the southern textile States are sadly handicapped from an educational standpoint. For example, in Massachusetts, where, at the time the Federal law was in effect, the State law required completion of the fourth grade [53] in school before a child could secure a work permit, 1.3 per cent of the children certificated during the school year 1917–18, had not met this requirement; 8.2 per cent came from the fourth grade; 11.9 per cent from the fifth grade; 16.8 per cent from the sixth grade; 18.5 per cent from the seventh grade; 19.5 per cent from the eighth grade; while 23.9 per cent came from the high schools of the State.[54] In Iowa the law required completion of the sixth

[52] California (with many exceptions), Kansas, Minnesota, Montana (with exceptions), Nebraska (some exceptions), New York (applies to children under 15 years of age only), and Vermont.

[53] Required also in Arkansas. In 1919 Massachusetts adopted a sixth-grade standard.

[54] Unpublished figures furnished by the Massachusetts State Board of Education.

grade [55] before children between 14 and 16 years of age could secure work permits. During the 1917–18 school year in Iowa, 21 per cent of the children who secured certificates came from the sixth grade, 29.1 per cent from the seventh grade, 34.1 per cent from the eighth grade, and 13 9 per cent from the high school.[56]

In Connecticut the State law required proof of ability to read with facility and write legibly simple sentences, and a knowledge of fractions, before children between 14 and 16 years of age could secure work permits.[57] As administered by the State board of education of Connecticut, this was substantially equivalent to completion of at least the fifth grade, for of the total number of children who were granted permits in that State in 1917–18, 0.4 per cent came from the fourth grade, 6.3 per cent from the fifth, 18.5 per cent from the sixth, 21.9 per cent from the seventh, 29.1 per cent from the eighth, and 23.8 per cent from the ninth grade and the high school.[58]

The New Orleans percentages are of special interest. There was no educational minimum established by the Louisana child-labor law;[59] but in that city certificates have been carefully issued and inspections regularly made for a number of years, so that the children have received such protection as could be given them under the State law. In 1918, 5 per cent of the children certificated in New Orleans came from the high school, 12.9 per cent came from the eighth grade, 17.5 per cent from the seventh grade, 21.6 per cent from the sixth grade, 20.6 per cent from the fifth grade, and 13.8 per cent from the fourth grade.[60] In 1910, when these records were first kept for New Orleans, the largest number of children certificated came from the fifth grade and the second largest number from the fourth grade.[61] In 1918 the largest number came from the sixth grade, the second largest number from the fifth, and more came from the seventh than from the fourth grade.

---

[55] Seven States in addition to Iowa have this educational requirement, namely, Maine, Michigan, Ohio (seventh for girls), Oregon (ruling of State board of inspection of child labor requires completion of 6A grade; ruling of industrial welfare commission requires eighth grade for work during school hours), and Pennsylvania, West Virginia, and Wisconsin (with exceptions: seventh grade after July 1, 1920).

[56] The per cent of children from ungraded schools was 1.8. State of Iowa, 1918. Report of the Bureau of Labor Statistics for the Biennial Period ending June 30, 1918, p. 102.

[57] The educational requirement is similar in the District of Columbia, Florida, and Idaho. Ability to read and write is required in Colorado, Missouri, New Hampshire, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, South Dakota, and Utah.

[58] Unpublished figures for 1917-18 supplied by the Connecticut State Board of Education.

[59] Nine states (Louisiana, Mississippi, Nevada, New Mexico, South Carolina, Texas, Virginia, Washington, and Wyoming) had no educational requirements; four (Alabama, Georgia, North Carolina, and Tennessee) required attendance during a specified period—three or four months—during the year preceding the issuance of the certificate. (See p 112 for North Carolina law of 1919.)

[60] There were also 5.2 per cent from the third grade, 2.2 per cent from the second grade, 0.7 per cent from the first grade and 0.5 per cent had never been to school. These figures include children 16 to 17 years of age. Compiled from Eleventh Report of the Factories Inspection Department of the Parish of Orleans for the year ending Dec. 31, 1918, p. 8.

[61] These figures include children 16 to 17 years of age. Ninth Report of the Factories Inspection Department of the Parish of Orleans for the year ending Dec. 31, 1916, p. 6.

Paterson, N. J., a textile town where the children are very largely foreign born, or native born of foreign parentage, reports that 22.9 per cent of the public-school children who received work permits came from the high school, 26.7 per cent from the eighth grade, 22.9 per cent from the seventh grade, and 27.5 per cent from the sixth grade.[62] Wisconsin at the time the Federal law was in effect, required that children between 14 and 16 years of age must have completed the fifth grade,[63] or have attended school seven years, or have received instruction required in enumerated subjects substantially equivalent to the fifth-grade requirements. In Milwaukee 8.2 per cent of the children who secured work permits were from the high school, 29.8 per cent from the eighth grade, 20.9 per cent from the seventh, 22.4 per cent from the sixth, 14.7 per cent from the fifth, and 3.7 per cent came from grades below the fifth.[64]

The figures as to grade last attended make a better educational showing for the group of children for whom Federal certificates were issued than the facts warrant. It has already been pointed out that only the child's statement on this point was secured, and one who said he came from the "first room" or the "first reader" was classified as a first-grade child. For purposes of identification, each child was required to sign the office record (information card) kept of his application and the certificate furnished the employer. This was more of a standardized test than was the grade last attended. Classification on this basis indicates that a very much larger number of these children were going to work without the most elementary education.

Thus, although only 188 children reported they had never been to school at all and 1,615 had never been beyond the first grade, Table IV shows that there were 1,915 who had to make their cross on the certificate because they were unable to sign their names, and 3,379 more whose signatures were illegible.

---

[62] Figures are from the unpublished report in the superintendent's office, Paterson, N. J. The per cents given are for the children from the public school. The grade last attended was not reported for 259 children (18.1 per cent of the total number certificated) who came from parochial schools.

[63] Wisconsin now requires completion of sixth grade (with exceptions), and after July 1, 1920, completion of seventh grade will be required. Completion of the fifth grade is required in Arizona, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Maryland, and New Jersey. In Maryland, outside Baltimore City, completion of the seventh grade is required for permit to work during school hours.

[64] Annual Report of the Attendance Department of the Board of School Directors of the City of Milwaukee for the school year ending June 30, 1918, p. 89.

TABLE IV.—*Number and per cent of children for whom Federal certificates of age were issued Sept. 1, 1917, to June 3, 1918, with specified ability to sign their names, by State of issuance and sex of child.*

State of issuance and sex of child.	Total children.		Signatures legible.		Signatures illegible.		Unable to sign name.		Not asked to sign.	
	Number.	Per cent.	Number.	Per cent.	Number.	Per cent.	Number.	Per cent.	Number.	Per cent.
All States	19,696	100.0	14,941	71.3	3,379	17.2	1,915	9.7	361	1.8
Boys	9,996	100.0	6,594	66.0	1,972	19.7	1,247	12.5	183	1.8
Girls	9,700	100.0	7,447	76.8	1,407	14.5	668	6.9	178	1.8
North Carolina	9,377	100.0	6,206	66.2	2,096	22.4	787	8.4	288	3.1
Boys	4,650	100.0	2,813	60.5	1,169	25.1	523	11.2	145	3.1
Girls	4,727	100.0	3,393	71.8	927	19.6	264	5.6	143	3.0
South Carolina	5,874	100.0	4,280	72.9	719	12.2	815	13.9	60	1.0
Boys	3,006	100.0	2,041	67.9	435	14.5	499	16.6	31	1.0
Girls	2,868	100.0	2,239	78.1	284	9.9	316	11.0	29	1.0
Georgia	2,897	100.0	2,217	76.5	432	14.9	237	8.2	11	0.4
Boys	1,480	100.0	1,047	70.7	268	18.1	160	10.8	5	.3
Girls	1,417	100.0	1,170	82.6	164	11.6	77	5.4	6	.4
Virginia	1,210	100.0	1,079	89.2	77	6.4	53	4.4	1	.1
Boys	702	100.0	588	83.8	68	9.7	45	6.4	1	.1
Girls	508	100.0	491	96.7	9	1.8	8	1.6	.....	.....
Mississippi	338	100.0	259	76.6	55	16.3	23	6.8	1	.3
Boys	158	100.0	105	66.5	32	20.3	20	12.7	1	.6
Girls	180	100.0	154	85.6	23	12.8	3	1.7	.....	.....

If ability to write their names legibly had been a requirement, 5,294, or more than one-fourth of those to whom certificates were given, would have been unable to qualify. The inaccuracies of the grades reported are shown by comparison between the ability to write their names and the grade last attended by the children. Certainly those in the third grade ought to be able to pass this test; but, as the figures in Table V show, almost 1,100 children who stated that they had attended the third grade were unable to do this; also, more than 300 who were in the fifth, and more than 100 who were in the sixth. This showing must be due to incorrect reports on the part of the children, or poorly graded schools, or both.

TABLE V.—*Children for whom Federal certificates of age were issued Sept. 1, 1917, to June 3, 1918, who were unable to write their names legibly, by school grade last attended.*

Ability to sign name.	Total children.	Never attended school.	School grade last attended.									
			First grade.	Second grade.	Third grade.	Fourth grade.	Fifth grade.	Sixth grade.	Seventh grade.	Eighth grade.	Ninth grade.	Not reported.
Children unable to sign their names	1,915	163	927	447	195	69	21	13	6	6	.....	68
Children unable to sign their names legibly	3,379	11	406	812	903	709	330	113	42	4	1	48

Judged by both the grade attended and the legibility of the signatures, of the States in which Federal certificates were issued, Virginia made the best showing, with Mississippi, Georgia, North Carolina, and South Carolina following in the order named.

In both the grade attended and the ability to write legibly, the girls made a better showing than the boys. In the writing test, 76.8 per cent of all the girls for whom Federal certificates were issued were able to write their names legibly, and only 66 per cent of the boys; 6.9 per cent of the girls as compared with 12.5 per cent of the boys were unable to sign their names at all.

In Virginia, 1.6 per cent of the girls and 6.4 per cent of the boys certificated, and in Mississippi, 1.7 per cent of the girls and 12.7 per cent of the boys, were unable to sign their names.

The meager educational equipment of the working children in these States was, perhaps, to be expected. In the group of States in which certificates were issued, illiteracy has been more general than in the North and West, and the movement to reduce it has had the opposition of a large group of people who were opposed to compulsory education because it meant education for the Negroes.

In 1917, when the Federal child-labor law went into effect and the issuance of certificates was begun, Mississippi had no compulsory education law.[65] South Carolina had passed one in 1915 which was, however, not mandatory until adopted by the local authorities, and Georgia had passed its first compulsory education law as recently as 1916. In North Carolina the compulsory school age had been 8 to 12,[66] but it was raised to 14 in July, 1917. In all these States attendance was required for a four-months period only.[67] By constitutional provision the compulsory school age in Virginia could not be extended by the legislature beyond 12 years of age.[68] The child-labor laws enacted in this group of States did not establish an educational minimum.

Though so little legislative progress along this line had been made, efforts to provide more and better schools and to raise the standard in the mill schools had greatly increased. A considerable decrease in illiteracy, therefore, might have been expected. The only figures available for comparison are those of the United States Census for 1910. They include adults among whom illiteracy is higher than among their children, and adults and children from the rural districts, where illiteracy is higher in all sections of the country than it is in industrial districts. For the purpose of this comparison, the figures are open to the criticism that they are based only on the statements made to census enumerators and not on any test of ability to read and write. So far as the figures for the children are concerned, it should be remembered that they include only the working children, among whom

[65] A local option law has since been passed.

[66] In two counties the age was 15.

[67] Subject to certain exemptions in South Carolina.

[68] A constitutional amendment has since been adopted by the legislature which, if ratified, will give the State legislature the power to extend the period of attendance.

the proportion of illiterates is always higher than among children whose parents are economically on a higher level.

Comparison with the census figures shows that the per cent of white children certificated who were unable to write their names was larger in the States of South Carolina and Mississippi than the per cent of illiterates among the native white of native parentage 10 years of age and over, in 1910.

States.	Per cent of white children certificated who were—		Per cent of illiterates among native white of native parentage 10 years of age and over in 1910.[1]
	Unable to sign their names.	Unable to sign their names legibly.	
North Carolina	8.0	21.9	12.3
South Carolina	13.6	12.1	10.5
Georgia	7.9	14.9	8.0
Virginia	2.5	4.9	8.2
Mississippi	6.8	16.3	5.3

[1] Thirteenth Census of the United States, 1910, vol. 1, Table 21, pp. 1204–1205.

If those unable to write their names legibly are counted illiterate, the illiteracy among these working children in 1917–18 was greater in every State except Virginia than the general illiteracy recorded by the census. To what extent these figures are an accurate measure of the education, or lack of it, among the white children between 14 and 16 years of age, or among the entire white population, can not be said. Much more than for a similar group of working children in the North, they measure the educational provision which the State and local committees are providing for the children of the State.

The southern industries have relied upon native white labor. The mill workers have been recruited from the "poor whites" of the mountains and the poor tenant or farm-hand class. The children in the mills are of the same class—either they or their parents came from the mountains and the farms. The great majority were born in the same State in which they went to work.

Thus, of the 9,377 children certificated in North Carolina, 8,569 were born in that State; and of the remainder, 339 came from the neighboring State of South Carolina and 269 from Virginia. In South Carolina, of 5,874 children who secured certificates, 4,555 were born in that State, and 708 came from North Carolina and 361 from Georgia.[69] Of the total number of children certificated only 24 reported that they were foreign born.

It might be said, therefore, that the responsibility for the educational neglect which these figures indicate was altogether a local one.

[69] See Appendix I, Table G, p. 171.

But in recent years the United States has assumed some responsibility for education. That it is now offering these States financial assistance and expert advice in providing vocational education for children is indicative of a national policy. The Federal child-labor law was in itself an expression of a national interest in the future of all the children of the country. The United States surely can not afford to ignore the national importance of at least an elementary education for all the children of the country.

The certification of colored children.—The South has relied primarily upon white labor for its factories; and Negro children, for the same reasons which exclude their parents, are employed in factories in very small numbers. Of the 25,330 applicants for Federal certificates of age, 2,118 were Negroes; and of the 19,696 to whom certificates were issued only 1,174 were of that race. These numbers are so small that a separate classification in the tables given seemed unnecessary, but some of the facts with reference to even this small group of colored children are of interest.

In general, documentary proof of age was much more difficult to secure for the colored than for the white children;[70] 68 per cent of the former, as compared with 75.8 per cent of the latter, presented what might be called acceptable documentary evidence of age. The proportion of birth certificates presented for the colored children was 1.2 per cent, as compared with only 0.7 per cent among the white; but as the number of colored children presenting documentary evidence of any kind, and especially birth certificates, was so small, this probably has no special significance. For example, in Georgia 8.3 per cent of the colored children certificated gave birth certificates as evidence of age; but only 60 colored children were certificated in that State, and most of the records of birth registration secured were for children born in Atlanta.

Among the white children, Bible records were the most common evidence presented; among the colored children, insurance policies.

In each State the proportion of colored children for whom certificates of physical age were accepted as proof of age was larger than the proportion of white children. Except in Virginia, where the proportion is about even, the percentage of white children refused on certificates of physical age was greater in every State than that of the colored children.[71] The fact that documentary evidence was lacking for so many colored children was a matter of special regret, as the issuing officers felt that the height and weight standards used in the issuance of certificates of physical age were too low for colored children, so that a larger proportion of the colored than of the white

[70] Appendix I, Table A, p. 165.
[71] Appendix I, Table B, p. 166.

children who were certificated may have been under 14 years of age. For this group of States, evidence from school records caused the refusal of certificates to colored and white children in about equal proportion, although in Virginia and in South Carolina the per cent was twice as large for the white as for the colored children.

The proportion of colored parents who admitted that their children were below the working age was strikingly large. This may have been due to ignorance on the part of the parents regarding the age standards of the law, and to the expectation—which was found to be quite general among white as well as colored people—that the age requirements were not so high for the colored children.

Industries for which first certificated.[72]—Approximately nine-tenths (90.3 per cent) of the white children entered textile mills, whereas only about one-fourth (25.5 per cent) of the colored children found occupation in the mills. In Georgia, 78.3 per cent of the colored children certificated went to work in textile mills—cotton and hosiery almost exclusively. A few cotton mills in this State have tried the experiment of using colored labor exclusively; but these mills did not always secure certificates for the children employed, so the actual number working was larger than the number certificated.

Over one-half (56.3 per cent) of the colored children certificated went to work in tobacco factories. In North Carolina, where 787 colored children were certificated, 512 (65.1 per cent) were employed in tobacco factories; in Virginia, 104 (49.5 per cent) found the same kind of work. In North Carolina the number of colored boys and girls employed in this industry was the same; in Virginia the number of boys was considerably higher than the number of girls.

Except in the tobacco stemmeries, the number of colored boys employed in tobacco factories was larger than the number of girls, but of all children certificated the number of girls who entered the textile mills and tobacco factories was larger than the number of boys. The colored children also changed jobs less frequently than did the whole group of children.[73]

Grade in school and ability to sign name.—The education of the colored children was somewhat inferior to that of the white children certificated. Thus, 1.8 per cent of the former as compared with 0.9 per cent of the latter reported they had never been to school at all; the per cent of colored children who had never been beyond the first grade was slightly higher than the per cent of white children; and the per cent of colored children who left school in the second and third grades was considerably higher. After that the differences in percentage were smaller, except for the sixth grade, where the percentage was higher for the white children. In the highest grades there was

[72] Appendix I, Table F, pp. 169–170.
[73] Appendix I, Table C, p. 167.

very little difference. For example, the per cent of colored children who were in the eighth grade when they left school was 2.2 as compared with 2.7 per cent of the white children.

TABLE VI.—*Number and per cent of colored children for whom Federal certificates of age were issued, September 1, 1917, to June 3, 1918, who had last attended grade specified, by State.*

State.	Total children.	Never attended school.	First grade.	Second grade.	Third grade.	Fourth grade.	Fifth grade.	Sixth grade.	Seventh grade.	Eighth grade.	Ninth and higher grades.	Not reported.
Total:												
Number	1,174	21	109	165	226	249	176	106	65	26	14	17
Per cent	100.0	1.8	9.3	14.1	19.3	21.2	15.0	9.0	5.5	2.2	1.2	1.4
North Carolina:												
Number	787	11	70	114	139	168	119	72	50	20	12	12
Per cent	100.0	1.4	8.9	14.5	17.7	21.3	15.1	9.1	6.4	2.5	1.5	1.5
South Carolina:												
Number	116	3	8	20	30	24	20	8	1	2	.....	.....
Per cent	100.0	2.6	6.9	17.2	25.9	20.7	17.2	6.9	.9	1.7	.....	.....
Georgia:												
Number	60	2	8	11	12	11	9	6	.....	.....	.....	1
Per cent	100.0	3.3	13.3	18.3	20.0	18.3	15.0	10.0	.....	.....	.....	1.7
Virginia:												
Number	210	5	23	19	45	46	28	20	14	4	2	4
Per cent	100.0	2.4	11.0	9.0	21.4	21.9	13.3	9.5	6.7	1.9	1.0	1.9
Mississippi:												
Number	1	.....	.....	1	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Per cent	100.0	.....	.....	100.0	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....

There were some State differences on these points. In South Carolina, the proportion of white children who did not go beyond the first grade was greater than the proportion of the colored thus handicapped. But in every other respect the educational showing of the Negro children in South Carolina was inferior to the white. In Georgia no colored children were reported beyond the sixth grade. In Virginia a larger number of colored children came from the fourth than from any other grade, while of the white children a larger number came from the sixth. In both South Carolina and Georgia the number of colored children certificated was so small that conclusions drawn from them probably have little significance.

It has already been pointed out that the children's statement of the grade last attended was not a reliable test of their education or lack of it. This was probably especially true of the colored children, as their schools were often inferior to those provided for the white children. Their ability to sign their names on the certificates is for them, as for the white children, a much more accurate test. As Table VII shows, only 61.2 per cent of the colored children certificated could sign their names legibly, and 14.6 per cent were unable to sign their names at all.

TABLE VII.—*Number and per cent of colored children for whom Federal certificates of age were issued September 1, 1917, to June 3, 1918, with specified ability to sign their names, by State of issuance and sex of child.*

State of issuance and sex of child.	Total children.		Signatures legible.		Signatures illegible.		Unable to sign their names.		Not asked to sign.	
	Number.	Per cent.	Number.	Per cent.	Number.	Per cent.	Number.	Per cent.	Number.	Per cent.
All States	1,174	100.0	718	61.2	276	23.5	171	14.6	9	0.8
Boys	715	100.0	417	58.3	167	23.4	126	17.6	5	.7
Girls	459	100.0	301	65.6	109	23.7	45	9.8	4	.9
North Carolina	787	100.0	462	58.7	218	27.7	100	12.7	7	.9
Boys	434	100.0	233	53.7	123	28.3	73	16.8	5	1.2
Girls	353	100.0	229	64.9	95	26.9	27	7.6	2	.6
South Carolina	116	100.0	64	55.2	21	18.1	31	26.7	.....	.....
Boys	79	100.0	45	57.0	12	15.1	22	27.8	.....	.....
Girls	37	100.0	19	51.4	9	24.3	9	24.3	.....	.....
Georgia	69	100.0	37	61.7	9	15.0	12	20.0	2	3.3
Boys	31	100.0	21	67.7	5	16.1	5	16.1	.....	.....
Girls	29	100.0	16	55.2	4	13.8	7	24.1	2	6.9
Virginia	210	100.0	154	73.3	28	13.3	28	13.3	.....	.....
Boys	170	100.0	117	68.8	27	15.9	26	15.3	.....	.....
Girls	40	100.0	37	92.5	1	2.5	2	5.0	.....	.....
Mississippi	1	100.0	1	100.0	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Boys	1	100.0	1	100.0	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Girls	.....	100.0	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....

Among the white children certificated, 9.4 per cent had to make a cross on their certificates, and 71.9 per cent could write their names legibly. Among the white children in every State in which certificates were issued, the girls made a better showing than the boys on this test; among the colored children this was true only of North Carolina and Virginia, but very few colored children were certificated in the other States.

The only available figures with which the illiteracy of these colored children can be compared are the general figures given in the census for 1910. It should be remembered that the children certificated were working children and that they came from families who give their children less education than do those of a higher economic level. The census figures, on the other hand, include adults, among whom illiteracy is more general than among the children, and rural children who, among both white and colored, North as well as South, have inferior school opportunities. Such as they are, the figures given below show that in North and South Carolina the rate of illiteracy among the colored children who went into factory work was higher than the rate among all negroes 10 years of age and over in 1910.

States.	Per cent of negro children certificated who were—		Per cent of illiterates among negroes 10 years of age and over in 1910.[1]
	Unable to sign their names.	Unable to sign their names legibly.	
North Carolina	12.7	27.7	31.9
South Carolina	26.7	18.1	38.7
Georgia	20.0	15.0	36.5
Virginia	13.3	13.3	30.0

[1] Thirteenth Census of United States, 1910, Vol. 1, Table 21, pp. 1204–1205.

INSPECTIONS UNDER THE CHILD-LABOR ACT OF 1916.

Inspections under the child-labor act began as soon as the law went into effect, but, owing to a postponement of the civil service examinations, the full staff of inspectors was not available until several months later, so that this work was hardly under way before the law was declared unconstitutional.

RELATION BETWEEN FEDERAL AND STATE INSPECTORS.

The first consideration in planning the inspections was the work already being done by the various State departments of labor or of factory inspection in the enforcement of State child-labor laws. The Children's Bureau was convinced that the full value of a national minimum for the protection of children would never be secured except through a genuine working relationship between Federal and State officials. The resources of both were inadequate for the task before them. It was important that needless Federal inspections should be avoided, and that so far as they were made they should result in a strengthening of respect for both State and Federal laws—that, so far as possible, experience and interest should be pooled. With this in view a conference of State officials was called by the Secretary of Labor on July 27, 1917, so that the committee composed of the Secretaries of Labor, Commerce, and the Attorney General might have the benefit of the advice of State officials before the rules and regulations were adopted, and the Child-Labor Division, the opportunity for a more detailed discussion of what were the common problems of State and Federal officers.

This conference was attended by officials from the District of Columbia and 28 States, as follows: Alabama, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Missouri, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia, and Wisconsin.

The State commissioners and chief factory inspectors who came from these States voted that they desired to have formal recognition by the Federal Government, and in accordance with their vote all State officers charged by statute with the enforcement of a State child-labor law were commissioned by the Secretary of Labor to assist in the enforcement of the Federal act. In commissioning them, attention was called to the fact that inspections would be made by the Child-Labor Division in any State either upon its own initia-

tive, upon complaints of violations, or upon the request of State officials.

The help given by the State officials in the enforcement of the Federal act was substantial. It began in some States before the law went into effect, with an educational campaign to acquaint employers and parents with the provisions of the act. In a number of States in which children between 14 and 16 years of age were allowed under the State law to work more than eight hours a day, State inspectors checked time records in the course of their regular inspections to see whether the Federal eight-hour standard was being violated and called the attention of the employers to the fact that their products could not be shipped in interstate or foreign commerce if the Federal standard was not observed.

An inspector of the Child-Labor Division was assigned the special duty of cooperating with State officials, and joint inspections with State inspectors were tried out in a number of localities. These were useful in acquainting Federal and State inspectors with the methods followed by each and in impressing employers with the fact that Federal and State officials were working together. It was felt, however, that if long continued, joint inspections would be wasteful, as the time of two sets of inspectors was consumed for work which could be done by one. A regular exchange of information was probably what each needed from the other, and with this end in view, arrangements were made by the Child-Labor Division to send to the State a summary of the findings of its inspectors, as well as all "Opinions of General Interest" and "Announcements of Judgments," which were published from time to time.

On the basis of their child-labor legislation the States could be classified roughly into three groups—(1) a number which had enacted child-labor laws with standards higher than those of the Federal law; (2) a much larger number whose age and hour standards were the same; and (3) a smaller number with lower standards. The differences in administration were much more difficult to classify. In some the appropriation given the State factory-inspection department was altogether inadequate; in some, conviction of violations of the law were very difficult to secure because of local prejudice; in some, a combination of political and economic conditions kept a department impotent.

The general plan of inspection made was that during the first year inspections should be largely confined to the most important child-employing industries in those States in which the standards established by law were below those of the Federal act, or in those States in which opposition to the State law had prevented its enforcement or greatly modified it in practice. All inspections were to be confined to mines, quarries, mills, canneries, workshops, factories, and manu-

facturing establishments that were sending their products in interstate and foreign commerce. It was believed that the first year would necessarily be merely an exploration of what was, from a national standpoint, a new field, and any plans made had that end in view.

INSPECTION OF MILLS, CANNERIES, WORKSHOPS, FACTORIES, AND MANUFACTURING ESTABLISHMENTS.

The principal child-employing establishments included under the terms of the Federal act were, according to the latest available census figures, the textile industries—cotton, knitting, silk, and woolen and worsted mills—mines; canning and tobacco factories; printing and publishing establishments; saw and planing mills; boot and shoe, glass, and furniture factories. Except where local conditions made it desirable to include some other, the exploration inspections were confined to these industries.

Before the act was declared unconstitutional inspections had been made of 689 establishments situated in 24 States and the District of Columbia, and of 28 mines situated in 4 States.[a]

Violations of the law were found in 293 of the 689 mills, factories, etc., inspected—there were 385 children under 14 years of age found employed; and 978 children between 14 and 16 years of age were working more than 8 hours a day, 3 more than 6 days a week, and 116 between 7 p. m. and 6 a. m., in mills, factories, etc., which were regularly shipping in interstate or foreign commerce.

The child-labor law of 1916 had been much discussed at the time of and subsequent to its passage; in the States with lower standards much publicity had been given to the provisions of the law through the certificate-issuing officers; in the States with the same or higher standards there was general familiarity with the law. A year elapsed between the passage and the time the act went into effect, so there was more than time enough for the necessary adjustments to be made. The act prescribed a less severe penalty for a first than for subsequent offenses and allowed the judge much latitude in the amount he fixed. It was assumed to be the duty of the division to recommend to the Department of Justice for prosecution all those against whom conclusive evidence of a violation of the law was secured.

Before the act was declared unconstitutional 8 employers had pleaded guilty and fines had been imposed as follows:[74] One, $50; 3, $100; 1, $150; 2, $160; and 1, $300; 17 cases were pending at the time the law was declared unconstitutional; 21 others had been sent to the Department of Justice recommending prosecution. The

[a] In Tables H and J, Appendix I, the violations found classified by States are given.

[74] One of the eight pleaded guilty the day before the law was declared unconstitutional. In two cases complaint was lodged by the State factory inspector of Oregon

others were in preparation for transmission by the law officer of the division or were awaiting some further reports.

As is shown by Table H, in some States only two or three inspections were made; these were made either in the course of an investigation of the certificating system, or by the inspector in charge of State relations during a visit to a State official for conference, or on complaint of violations received. As the entire staff were unacquainted with the type of inspections necessary under the Federal law, especially with the proof of removal and shipment which had to be secured, a number of inspections were made in the immediate vicinity of Washington for the purpose of familiarizing inspectors with report forms before they were sent into the field.

Inspectors were instructed that a thorough investigation of the ages of the children under 16 or suspected of being under 16 should be made whether certificates were or were not found on file. This was felt to be necessary in order to obtain information as to how carefully certificates were being issued, for the purpose of deciding whether or not the acceptance of State certificates should be continued. As these reports came in from different cities and towns in one State after another the conviction grew that, if State certificates were to be accepted, an approximately uniform enforcement of the Federal act would be impossible unless a State administrative as well as a statutory standard in certificating were secured.

In the States of Alabama, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Mississippi, North Carolina, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia a sufficient number of mills, factories, and canneries were visited to make a brief discussion of the findings of some interest. These inspections were not made for the purpose of reaching general conclusions with reference to the individual States, except as those conclusions bore upon immediate or future plans for securing the enforcement of the Federal law.

Alabama.

The first of the States mentioned above, Alabama, was designated as a State in which the certificates issued under the State law should be accepted for the purposes of the Federal act. It belonged to class 4 in the classification of States given on page 19, that is, it was a State in which the evidence of age required by the State law did not meet the standards laid down by the Federal act, but discretion was lodged in the administrative officers, so that it was hoped it would be possible to raise the local standards in practice. The Alabama law required as evidence of age the following, in the order given: Birth record, passport, baptismal certificate, or such other evidence of age as would convince the issuing officer that the child was 14 years of age or over—an affidavit of a parent was given as an example of the last.

Certificates were issued by the local school authorities; and as birth records, passports, or baptismal certificates were difficult and often impossible to procure, the parent's affidavit had come to be, in practice, almost exclusively relied upon as a proof of age. But since under the terms of the law the test was to be whether or not the issuing officer was convinced of the age of the child, it was not necessary to resort to a parent's affidavit in any case.

The age standard of the Alabama law for regulating the employment of children in factories was the same as the Federal, but the hours of children between 14 and 16 were not limited to eight. The State inspector of Alabama, who was appointed by the State board of health and supervised the inspection of jails and almshouses as well as factories for the State, endeavored to bring the Alabama practice up to the Federal standard. After the Federal rules and regulations were adopted, new State forms were prepared, and a letter of explanation was sent to the school officers of the State calling their attention to the Federal requirements and asking them not to accept the parent's affidavits but to insist on evidence in the order required under regulation 2.[75] The attention of employers also was called to the provisions of the Federal law and the importance of the cooperation of the school superintendents in securing a good certificating system. The State inspector had, however, no authority to supervise the work of the school principals or teachers in the issuance and no authority to suspend or revoke certificates illegally issued. He rightly felt that this constituted a serious difficulty in the enforcement of the State law; and at his request a Federal inspector was sent to work in the State and spent six weeks in inspecting factories in 21 cities and towns.

Alabama is a textile State with many cotton mills which employ children. As in the other southern States, most of the mills of Alabama have built houses for their employees and have usually furnished the school building and grounds for the mill school. Sometimes the county paid the salaries of the principal and teachers, but frequently the expenses were met in part by the mill owners and in part from the general educational funds. The mill operatives were generally regarded as a class by themselves and usually formed a separate community, whether the mill village was isolated or in a large city.

Although an energetic effort was made by the State inspector to secure a uniform system of issuing certificates there was the greatest diversity. In one city no certificates were being issued; and in Birmingham, a city of approximately 200,000 people, a private organization was supposed to be doing this work for the superintendent of schools, but at the time of the inspector's visit practically

[75] Appendix II, pp. 177-178.

no certificates were being issued because the private society had been without a head. In one town two cotton mill communities were separated by a river. The principal of the schools on one side of the river was issuing certificates in accordance with the Federal regulations; on the other side, where more children were being certificated, instructions were generally disregarded.

Sometimes in cities where the local issuing officers made every effort to obtain evidence of age before accepting a physician's certificate of physical age, it was found, when the Federal agent went to the homes of these children, that documentary proof of age was obtainable which had been refused the school principal. In one mill center the overseer of the mill had advised the children not to show their evidence to the principal, and he had great difficulty in issuing properly in consequence. In this case the principal of the school reported that he had been threatened with dismissal by the board of education, which was composed of mill officials, if he refused to issue certificates as the board directed.

The physician's certificate of physical age as used in Alabama was an unsuccessful proof of age. In two towns, when the employers learned the height and weight standards required for a certificate of physical age, a physician was sent to the school to weigh and measure about 50 children. He filled out certificates of physical age for them regardless of whether they had applied for work or had any intention of leaving school. Some of the children were not yet 14 years of age, according to their school records. In theory, the issuing officer was supposed to keep their cards, and as soon as their birthdays came around, the child was given an employment certificate on the physical examination previously given. In another city the doctor who issued the certificate of physical age was an employee of the mill and issued the certificates to children without even weighing them himself, but accepting instead the child's word as to its weight.

While in these and a few other instances there was an obvious lack of freedom on the part of the officials connected with the school and public-health service and a desire on the part of the mill management to compel illegal issuance of the certificates, this was not usually the case; some principals of the mill schools were observing the State law and the Federal regulations more carefully than were the principals of the town schools.

The compulsory-education law of Alabama required the attendance at school of all children between 8 and 15 years of age for 80 days,[76] and the State child-labor law required the child's attendance at school for 60 days during the year immediately preceding the date on which a certificate is issued.

[76] The county superintendent could reduce this to 60 days.

The school officers as a general rule were careful about requiring the proper number of days' attendance before a certificate was issued to a child. In some of the cities and villages the parents knew just how many days the 14-year-old child must still go to school before he could be put in the mill. Sometimes the mill officials hampered the issuing officer by insisting upon certificates for children who had not been in school the required time; and in one or two cases the mill people had lists in their offices of all 14-year-old children in the school, with the dates when their compulsory schooling would end, so they could send for a child as soon as the law had been complied with.

Certificates were on file for 561 of the 609 children under 16 years of age found at work during the Alabama inspections; 48 children were found employed without any certificates, and it was necessary to revoke certificates for 49 children because they had been illegally issued.

In connection with this investigation of the certificating system, 52 establishments were inspected in the 21 towns visited. These included 29 cotton mills, 11 hosiery mills, 2 cordage and twine mills, 1 silk mill, 2 overall factories, 1 embroidery factory, 1 paper factory, 1 window and door-screen factory, 1 foundry and machine shop, 1 lumber mill, and 2 bakeries.

Of the 609 children under 16 years of age found employed in mills and factories 14 were under 14 years of age, and 595 were between the ages of 14 and 16. Of the 14 children employed in violation of Federal and State standards, 10 were found in 7 textile mills,[77] 1 in a hosiery mill, 1 in a bakery, and 2 in a window and door-screen factory. In some cases these under-age children were working on employment certificates which were incorrectly issued.

There were 29 hour violations in 14 factories. In 13 of these, children under 16 were employed more than eight hours a day, and one child was employed after 7 o'clock in the evening. All these children had said they were 16 years of age, but the employers had made little effort to establish the truth of the children's statements.

No opinions had been rendered as to whether the Federal child-labor law covered home work, but inspectors were asked to report evidence of home work which came to their attention in the course of their factory inspections. In Alabama home work was generally found in towns in which knitting mills were located—little children were assisting their mothers by turning or mending the stockings or socks. In one of the homes in which the mother was found doing home work a child was sick with measles and in another with mumps.

[77] This includes 1 violation in an overall factory.

Delaware.

Delaware belonged to the group of States whose State child-labor standards were below those of the Federal act. It permitted children 12 years of age and over to work in canneries, boys of 12 to work on "provisional" certificates when not required by law to attend school; and in cases of poverty the chairman of the labor commission could give special permits to work to children who were unable to get either general or provisional certificates. The hours of employment for children under 16 were limited under the State law to 10 hours per day and 54 hours a week and 6 days a week. Night work was prohibited between 7 p. m. and 6 a. m.

An inspector of the Child-Labor Division was sent to Delaware in May, 1918. Prior to June 3, when the law was declared unconstitutional, 19 establishments had been inspected. These included 6 basket factories, 3 knitting mills, 2 woolen and worsted mills, 1 silk and 1 jute factory, 2 bleacheries, 1 cigar factory, 1 rubber belting and hose factory, and 2 canning factories. No violations were found in any of the textile factories except 1 bleachery, where 10 children between 14 and 16 years of age were found working more than 8 hours a day. Violations were found in each of the 6 basket factories. In 1 of these one 10-year-old child, two children 11, and five children 12 years of age were found at work. In 1 of the canneries, a strawberry-packing plant, 4 children 11 years of age, 14 children 12 years of age, and 9 children 13 years of age were found hulling or "capping" berries. The youngest child, who was 7 years of age, was helping his mother make bottoms for berry baskets.

The children found employed in Delaware were not only very young but also their hours of work were often long. The basket factories and canneries inspected kept no time records. In both the hours were irregular, as the children were usually pieceworkers and were given much freedom as to the hours at which they began and stopped work. Many of the children worked the full time the establishments were in operation, from 6 or 7 in the morning until 5 or 6 in the evening. In the 6 basket factories 21 children under 14 years of age and 29 under 16 were working more than 8 hours a day.

Of the 236 children under 16 found employed in the course of the inspections there were no certificates or work permits on file for 78 children, whose age, therefore, had not been legally established before they went to work. In addition, in the case of 30 of these children who were employed in factories, the doctor's examination to determine physical fitness and proof of completion of the fifth grade in school required under the State law had been evaded. Although the law provided a legal possibility of escaping these requirements through the provisional certificates, or special permits issued on the ground of poverty, no certificate or permit of any sort had been

obtained by these children. While the inspections made indicated that the certificating law was being followed in Wilmington, in the smaller towns visited it was being generally disregarded, so that, as in many States, there was a State-wide certificating standard in law but not in administration.

Florida.

During the winter of 1917–18, 14 shrimp, oyster, and fish canneries were inspected in Florida. Of these, 11 were in Apalachicola, 2 were in Nassau County, north of Jacksonville, and 1 was in Pensacola. These inspections are difficult to make because the season is of uncertain length, and the daily operations of the canneries are dependent upon whether the fishing boats come in and the size of the catch. There may be no work for several days, and then next day long hours, beginning before dawn. Like vegetable and fruit canneries, they are often situated at a distance from the towns, so the approach of an inspector may easily be reported. Seven of the canneries inspected were found violating the Federal law—4 of the 7 were employing children under 14 years of age, and 5 were employing children more than 8 hours a day, and all were shipping their products in interstate commerce.

Reports received from several sources indicated that the employment of children was much more general than these numbers indicate. A few of the superintendents said they were not employing children but merely allowed them to come with their mothers because there was no place else for them to go. The testimony of most of the superintendents was to the contrary. One superintendent said quite frankly that they "worked them, any old age," and "adults and children look alike to us." Another asked the Federal inspector's permission to put the children back to work, because he had a lot of shrimp on hand that would spoil if the children did not help him out. Still another canner said he considered his cannery public property; anyone could come and work who wanted to. When asked if he hired the children whom the inspector found at work, he said: "No, I neither hire nor fire anyone." He said he did not know, and, furthermore, did not care, who peeled the cups full of shrimp that were brought to the checker for pay—that his only interest was to get the shrimp peeled.

In the oyster canneries very young children are used to shuck the oysters and in the shrimp canneries to peel the shrimp. In 3 of those inspected the ages of the children under 14 who were found at work were as follows: Three were 13, 4 were 12, 7 were 11, 3 were 10, 5 were 9, 2 were 8, and 1 was 7 years of age.

The hours in the canneries were irregular, depending upon the supply of shrimps and oysters; some days were short and others excessively long. Occasionally the work day began at 5 a. m., but

oftener at 7 a. m., and ended any time from 4 to 6 p. m. A work day of 10 and 11 hours was not unusual when weather was propitious for shrimp fishing. It was evident that in few of the establishments had the 8-hour day been adhered to as a standard.

The Florida law provided that employment certificates were to be issued by local school authorities. In order to obtain an employment certificate, it was necessary that a child present as evidence of age a passport, a duly attested transcript of birth, or a baptismal or other religious record. In the absence of such birth certificate, the parent or guardian could make affidavit before the issuing officer as to the child's age. The child was also required to present a school record which would contain a statement certifying that he had attended school regularly for not less than 60 days during the previous school year, was able to read and write simple English sentences, and had had instruction in spelling, reading, writing, geography, and arithmetic up to and including fractions. In the course of the investigation of the ages of the children found at work, evidence was secured which showed that the certificates were carelessly issued. One superintendent explained that he had issued some certificates to children nearly 14 to work in factories which were badly in need of help, as he thought there would be no harm in it. He had not required any evidence of age from the applicants. As an excuse for this violation of the State law, he said he was opposed to it because it "tends to make legalized criminals of working people, and children should have a chance, as they are the best workers in the shrimp business."

The evidence usually accepted was the affidavit of the parent. No duplicates of certificates issued were kept, nor were the numbers issued recorded. The canners generally did not understand that the State law required them to keep certificates on file. It was not surprising, therefore, that no effort had been made to secure certificates for 45 out of 69 children under 16 found employed.

Georgia.

Georgia child-labor standards were below those of the Federal act; but as Federal certificates of age were issued in the State, employers were thoroughly familiar with the provisions of the law. Prior to June 3, 1918, while the Federal child-labor law was effective, 38 inspections were made in 15 cities and towns of Georgia. Twenty-nine of these inspections were made in textile mills, manufacturing cotton, woolen, and knit goods, and cordage; 4 were engaged in the manufacture of confectionery; 2 in clothing; and 1 each in wooden boxes, furniture, and tinware. Factories that the issuing officers of the Child-Labor Division had reason to believe were violating the law were inspected as a matter of course, but others were visited against which no complaints had been made.

In the course of the inspections of these 38 factories, 24 children under 14 years of age were found employed in violation of both the Federal and the State age standards. Of this number, 21 were found at work in cotton and knitting mills, 2 in the manufacture of confectionery, and 1 in a furniture factory. In the textile mills, children were employed in spinning, doffing, quilling, spooling, sweeping, inspecting, drawing, winding, weaving, looping, etc. In the manufacture of confectionery, children were machine dipping and were employed at odd jobs in the stick-candy room and cracker department. In the manufacture of clothing, they were employed as folders, trimmers, and pocket hands; and as laborers in the manufacture of tin cans.

Not infrequently the names of children under 14 who were found at work did not appear on pay rolls or on time records. In such cases they were assisting some older member of the family, who received the pay for the services of both.

In 17 factories, 99 children under 16 years of age were working more than 8 hours a day, some of them 10 and 11 hours; in 5 factories, 16 such children were working at night or, more exactly, between 7 p. m. and 6 a. m. Altogether there were 115 violations of the Federal hour standards found in the course of the inspections made in Georgia. Certificates were generally required by Georgia factories for all the children they employed. Factories which did not desire Federal certificates were inspected because it was believed that all those really endeavoring to live up to the law would desire certificates. In the factories inspected no certificates were on file for more than half the children under 16 years of age who were found at work. In some cases the superintendents believed the children were over 16 years of age; and a few had really thought that they were themselves securing proof of age, hence Federal certificates were unnecessary. Following the inspections and a demonstration of the errors that were being made and the consequences of indifference to errors, Federal certificates were desired.

Illinois.

A new State child-labor law became effective in Illinois July 1, 1917, which required completion of the fifth grade in school and an examination to establish physical fitness for the work contemplated and made equally important changes in the work permit system. Under the old law permits had been issued by superintendents or principals of both private and public schools, and the evidence required as proof of age was (1) the last school census, (2) the certificate of birth or baptism, (3) the record of public or parochial schools, or (4) certificate of age from juvenile or county court, based upon oath of parent. In practice the school records had been quite generally relied upon. The law enacted in 1917 required substantially the same evidence of age as regulation 2 of the Federal regu-

lations.[78] A new certificate was required with each change of job, and new forms were required also, so that a rather complete revolution in the methods of issuing was effected by the new law. The State factory inspector and the director of the Child-Labor Division were of the opinion that, as certificates issued under the old law did not meet the requirements of the Federal regulations, employers whose products were destined for interstate or foreign commerce must procure new certificates for children in their employ if they desired to avail themselves of the protection afforded by certificates under section 5 of the Federal act. A quite general reissuance of certificates was therefore necessary; and as some children who had been working for more than a year were unable to qualify under the new law because of the higher educational requirements, in consequence there was some confusion.

The State department of factory inspection endeavored to have a uniform interpretation of the law adopted by the various school superintendents who were authorized under the law to issue certificates. The Child-Labor Division was much interested in having certain minimum administrative standards adhered to in the certificating, and so, at the request of the chief factory inspector and the Child-Labor Committee of the Illinois Council of Defense, some inspections were made to test out the effectiveness of the certificating system. In all, 32 factories were inspected in 12 cities and towns.

In the course of the inspections only 314 children between 14 and 16 years of age were found employed in confectionery, cordage, clothing, tent, watch, glass, tobacco, and ammunition factories, and in the manufacture of iron, steel, brass, and tin products. No children under 14 were found at work, but 4 under 16 years of age were found working on the night shift in 2 glass-furnace rooms, 1 was working 7 days a week, and 11 were employed more than 8 hours a day. These violations of the hour standards of both Federal and State law were confined to 6 factories.

Observance of the new certificating law was not so general. No certificates were on file for 23 children found at work, and 60 were so defective that they were suspended by the inspector. The inspector found that where the superintendent of schools assumed immediate supervision of the certificating the law was usually followed, but that when this work was delegated without supervision to stenographers—as it was in four of the cities visited—the work was most unsatisfactorily done.

[78] The evidence of age required under the Illinois law of 1917 was (1) transcript of birth certificate; (2) baptismal certificate; (3) passport; (4) certificate of arrival, a Bible record, confirmation certificate, or insurance policy; (5) school record of two years' standing; (6) certificate of physical age from two physicians, one of whom must be connected with the public-health service or the public schools.

There was much difference in the evidence accepted as proof of age in the different localities visited. In two cities the superintendents were continuing to issue on the school record of age only and were not trying to secure the evidence required by the new law. In another, school records of age were generally used, but a few physicians' statements of age had been filed. Another city accepted school records of age without any corroborative evidence for one-third of the certificates issued; and in another the superintendent had accepted many parents' affidavits of children's ages when birth records were not easily accessible. In only five of the cities visited were the school officials securing the evidence of age in the order of preference indicated in the law of 1917. In these cities a very large percentage of the certificates were issued with birth and baptismal certificates as the evidence of age. In each city the requirements of the law and the importance of very carefully observing it was called to the attention of the superintendent by the inspector, and a report of the findings was sent to the State factory inspector and to the child-labor committee of the Illinois Council of Defense.

Illinois now is one of many States which have good certificate laws, except that in Illinois there is an absence of State supervision or control, so that the law is unevenly enforced. While the State factory inspector has endeavored to bring about some uniformity, he is without authority over the superintendent and principals. Following the inspections by the Child-Labor Division, the child-labor committee of the Illinois Council of Defense sent officers to the most important industrial communities of the State in order to promote general uniformity in the interpretation of the certificate law, and more especially to interest them in providing for careful examination of the physical fitness of each child to do the work contemplated and for the correction of physical defects discovered.

Indiana.

The Indiana child-labor law was in many respects below the Federal standard. It prohibited the employment of children under 14 in any gainful occupation (except that children from 12 to 14 were permitted to work in canneries between June 1 and Oct. 1), and of children between 14 and 16 at night work. It permitted a 9-hour day and a 54-hour week if the child's parent gave his written consent.

During the winter of 1917–18, 59 factories in 12 cities and towns in Indiana were inspected. The factories visited were representative of the most important child-employing industries, including the manufacture of food products, cotton, knit goods, clothing and furnishings, iron, steel, and foundry products, boxes, furniture, leather goods, printing, glass, and other miscellaneous articles.

In the factories inspected, 967 children between 14 and 16 years of age were found employed, also 4 children under 14 years—one each in 4 different factories.

The violations of the hour standards, both Federal and State, were much more numerous. Twenty-nine establishments, or about one-half of those inspected, were disregarding the eight-hour day and 3 the night-work restrictions. In the very few glass houses visited, 8 children under 16 were employed on the night shift. Altogether, 152 children were found to be working over eight hours a day. This means that 15 per cent of all the minors found were working overtime, and in at least one-fourth of these cases the violations were flagrant.

The Indiana law was particularly weak in its provisions with reference to the certificates or work permits. The school authorities were directed by the State law to accept as proof of age in the issuance of work permits the affidavit of the parent or guardian if a birth or baptismal certificate, a passport or a school enumeration, could not be secured. The Federal regulations did not permit the acceptance of either a school census record or a parent's affidavit unsupported by other evidence. After much discussion, Indiana had been designated as a State in which certificates issued under State authority would be accepted for the purposes of the Federal act, in the hope that in administrative practice it could be brought up to standard.

In the 59 factories inspected, 166 children who were under 16 years of age and for whom certificates were required under the State law were working without certificates. The inspector found that 24 of the certificates on file had been so illegally issued that their acceptance for the purposes of the Federal act had to be revoked.

In the towns visited the issuing officers were usually from the school attendance departments, although in a few the work was done in the school superintendent's office either by himself or his clerk. The school census was usually relied upon in every city except Indianapolis, where after September 1, 1917, the requirements of regulation 2 of the Federal rules and regulations were followed in issuing permits for children who were entering industries doing an interstate business. In general, although birth or baptismal certificates were available for a large number of children, no effort was made to secure them. In one city the superintendent of schools was issuing the certificates upon the application of the employer, without interviewing the child or his parents. Little attention had been given to the subject of record keeping, so that except in Indianapolis it was impossible to secure a complete record of the applicants considered or the number of certificates issued and refused.

Lack of uniformity in the issuance of certificates during the summer vacation was said to be more serious. In several places the school offices were closed and no certificates could be secured; but in one of those visited regular and vacation certificates had been issued and numbered in a separate series. In one city the issuing officer had interpreted the law to mean that during school vacation children under 14 years of age could secure permits.

Following this investigation, conferences were held by the inspector of the Child-Labor Division with local officers, with the officers of the State department of education, and with the State industrial board. All realized the difficulties and weaknesses of the Indiana law. They offered their help in trying to bring the issuing of certificates up to standard at all times, and in making special arrangements for issuance during the vacation period. Employers also were interested in an improvement of the system, as they found the suspensions of certificates that had been irregularly issued for children in their employ inconvenient, and they did not want to assume the risk involved in employing children without certificates during the summer. People were generally agreed that there was no reason why Indiana should not have as careful and thorough a system in releasing its children from school as any State had.

Although the attorney general of Indiana had given an opinion that "a child of any age may work after school, Saturday, and vacation, without a certificate," after a conference with several State officials and with the representatives of the Children's Bureau, he paved the way for providing for the summer season by ruling that "there is nothing in the law to prohibit vacation certificates even if it does not require them," and the State superintendent of public instruction notified all school boards and superintendents to continue issuing certificates during the summer of 1918. Arrangements with the State and local officers had not been completed when the law was declared unconstitutional, and in consequence the question of the redesignation of Indiana was still pending.

Iowa.

In Iowa 7 cities in the Mississippi Valley were visited and 21 factories inspected. Only 126 children between 14 and 16 years of age were employed in these factories; there were no children under 14, but 3 factories were violating the 8-hour provision of the law. In 1, a button factory, 6 children were working 9 hours for 3 days of the week, but shorter hours the other days, so that they were averaging the required 48 hours a week; this employer had thought if he kept within the 48-hour-week restriction he was observing the law.

In another establishment the office boy was working 9 hours a day; and in another a boy for whom there was a defective certificate filed,

showing him to be 16 when he was only 15, was working in the shipping department 10 hours a day.

Although there were permits on file for all except 4 of the 126 children under 16 years of age found at work, the issuing of work permits was not uniformly well done in the 7 cities visited. Proof of completion of the sixth grade in school or its equivalent was carefully insisted upon, but the physical examinations were often quite perfunctory and the proof of age accepted did not in general meet the requirements of the State law. This provided that evidence should be preferred in the following order: (1) Birth certificate; (2) passport or baptismal certificate; (3) school census record; and (4) physician's certificate of physical age. For most of the children the school census record was accepted, although other proof of age preferred under the law was available; occasionally a parent's affidavit was accepted, although this was entirely without legal warrant.

The forms used in connection with the certificating were supplied by the State superintendent of public instruction, and in connection with this duty he could if he desired do much to bring about uniform practices. Monthly reports of the certificates issued are sent to the commissioner of labor. In the course of the inspections made by his department a careful check of these lists is made with the children found at work and an effort has been made to impress the schools with the importance of their work in the issuing of certificates.

Opinion in Iowa seemed very generally to support a 16-year age limit for employment in factories. The number under that age employed, though small, was reported larger than usual because of the labor shortage and general economic conditions growing out of the war. Iowa is an agricultural rather than a manufacturing State. The last census of selected occupations [79] showed 16,049 boys and 627 girls under 16 years of age employed in agricultural pursuits, and only 1,161 boys and 440 girls employed in manufacturing. As in other States, the State child-labor law of Iowa did not prohibit the employment of children under 14 at farm work, and the period of compulsory attendance at school required under the State law was only six months, so that for six months of the year children might be employed on farms without age or hour limitations.

Mississippi.

Mississippi was one of the States in which Federal certificates of age were issued. It is not an important State industrially, but there are a few textile mills and some important shrimp and oyster canneries. The textile manufacturers, though opposed to the law,

[79] Thirteenth Census of the United States, 1910, Vol. IV, Table VII, pp. 459–460.

showed every disposition to obey it until it was held unconstitutional. Most of the canners, on the other hand, showed that they had every intention of violating the law. Federal certificates were issued to an employer only on promise of employment, and their return was required if the child left his employ. The canners represented that the employment of both adults and children was altogether casual, that they worked in one cannery one day and in another the next, as a delivery of fish provided an opportunity. Special arrangements were therefore made that the certificates issued to children in Biloxi and Gulfport, where the principal fish canneries were, could be filed in the school. The children were to be given the usual identification cards, and if all the children in the employ of a canner held these identification cards, the canner was to be regarded as having procured certificates within the meaning of section 5 of the Federal child-labor act. But employers did not as a rule require identification cards, and very few children applied for certificates.

During the time the child-labor law was in operation, 21 inspections were made in Mississippi—17 in canneries and 4 in textile mills. In the textile mills no children under 14 years of age were employed, and only 1 under 16 was employed more than eight hours a day. While all the canneries visited packed both shrimp and oysters, they were largely engaged in packing steamed oysters when the inspections were made in April and May of 1918. The difficulties usual in the inspection of canneries were experienced in Mississippi. The irregularity of the work and the concentration of the factories in two or three places, and preparation on the part of many employers to evade the law, made it difficult to secure evidence of the large numbers of very young children who were, in fact, being employed.

Crude attempts were made to prevent inspectors from interviewing the children or discovering them at work. In one instance, for example, the inspector was delayed to present his credentials while someone sent the children out. Nevertheless, 10 very young children were intercepted as they were leaving. Their soiled clothing, their hands, red and swollen from the steam and cut by the oyster shells and the shucking knives, made it impossible to deny that at least these 10 had been at work.

In the 15 inspections made of canneries, 152 children under 16 years of age were found at work. In 8 of these inspections, 30 children were found under 14 years of age—1 was only 5 years old, another 7, another 8, 2 were 9, 2 were 10, 4 were eleven, 7 were only 12, and 12 were 13 years of age.

In but few canneries inspected were time records of any sort kept. The work often began at 4 or 5 in the morning, and if the supply of oysters or shrimp held out it lasted all day. If the catch of fish was small, the work might last only a few hours. The children worked

on a piece-rate basis. Sometimes they were paid individually and sometimes what they earned was reckoned with their parents' earnings. Only two violations of the eight-hour law were established by the inspector, but 31 children under 16 years of age were found employed between 7 p. m. and 6 a. m.

In Mississippi, as in Florida and Maryland, some of the canners admitted that they employed children and said they always would do it if it was necessary to save the oysters. Others made familiar excuses—they did not employ or pay the children and were not responsible for their being there; the parents insisted on the children being allowed to work, etc. The local labor supply in the cannery district of Mississippi was usually augmented by groups of family workers brought down from Maryland. They were frequently foreign born and had sometimes worked in the fruit and vegetable canneries of Maryland before being brought south by "row bosses." [80] These families were often quite without any permanent home, so that no community felt really responsible for the education or physical care of the children.

In general, the canneries are small and quite unstandardized from a production and general business standpoint. Conforming to factory standards seems peculiarly difficult to them, and by exemptions in State laws they have been encouraged to take the attitude that the canning of perishable food is more important than the protection of children.

North Carolina.

The standards with reference to child labor were much lower in North Carolina than in the surrounding States, and opposition on the part of the manufacturers to the enactment of the Federal law was more general. It was therefore to be expected that in this State children would form a larger proportion of the total number of employees than in others. Complete figures as to the number employed are not available, but a very much larger number of certificates was issued here than in South Carolina.[81]

Because of the injunction granted in August, 1917, in the western district of North Carolina, restraining the United States attorney from enforcing the child-labor act on the ground of its unconstitutionality, it was the policy of the Child-Labor Division to make no inspections in that district.[82] In all, 109 mills and factories were inspected in the State prior to June 3, when the act was declared unconstitutional—4 fish canneries, 31 cotton mills, 32 hosiery and knitting mills, 4 silk mills, 27 tobacco stemmeries, 3 chewing and

[80] The "row boss" was a man appointed by the canner to engage workers. He was usually paid a certain amount for every person brought to the cannery and was on duty during the working hours to see that his people kept at work and accomplished the tasks laid out for them.

[81] See Appendix 1, Table A, p. 165.

[82] Through an error one inspection was made.

smoking tobacco factories, 2 buggy factories, 1 cigar factory, 1 box factory, 1 bag factory, 1 establishment manufacturing confectionery products, 1 manufacturing flour-mill products, and 1 lumber factory. There were 95 children under 14 years of age found at work; and 144 children between 14 and 16 years of age were working more than eight hours a day, 1 more than six days a week, and 18 between 7 p. m. and 6 a. m. Eight of these children who were working at night were employed in hosiery mills and 10 in tobacco stemmeries.

The canneries inspected were chiefly oyster canneries, where colored children were used to shuck the oysters. Some of the children were very young—one 7-year-old child stood on a box to reach the oysters but shucked quite steadily into her mother's pot. She worked only on Saturdays and after school. In another cannery the manager said that local children were not employed because school was in session, but that children under 14 came a 40-minute trip by boat down the Sound to work in this cannery because they were unable to get a teacher in their town. Until these canneries were visited by the issuing officer and an inspector of the Child-Labor Division, no attention had been paid by the management as to who did the work; anyone who came was allowed to shuck and was paid on a piece-rate basis. The plants often operated a 10-hour day, but work was quite irregular.

There were only 12 children under 14 employed in 7 of the cotton mills inspected; in 9 mills 41[83] children under 16 years of age worked more than 8 hours a day. Violations of the standards were much more frequent in the hosiery or knitting mills. In 7 of these mills, 48 children under 14 years of age were employed, and there were 60 violations of the hour standards. Three mills, 2 of them owned by the same company, were largely responsible for this showing. These were near the boundary of the western district and were quite willing to take their chances that the law would be declared unconstitutional.

Some home work on which quite young children were employed was found in the course of the inspections—for example, "stringing" tobacco sacks for one of the large tobacco companies. One hosiery mill inspected had tried the experiment of putting knitting machines into some of the homes when the Federal law became operative on September 1. The statement of two of the women in whose homes knitting machines had been placed are quoted, as they give not only the ages of the children but also something of the general social conditions. The first said in answer to the inspector's questions:

> The ——— people put four knitting machines in our house the first week in September. Mr. ——— brought yarn each morning and collected the socks the boys had

[83] Eighteen of these were in the one factory in the western district which was inspected.

knitted since his last visit. I have three boys who worked on the machines. A——— will be 15 the 15th of February next, B——— was 12 on November 8, and C——— will be 11 next March. Their father used to get them up at 5 in the morning, and if they hadn't finished their task in the day they often had to work at night. They'd 'a' liked it a lot better if they hadn't had to work such long hours. Except for half an hour out for each meal they worked right along from 5 or 6 or 7 in the morning until 7 at night or later, unless the machines got out of order, which they did a good deal. The needles used to break right often. The mill men said it was because we didn't keep the room warmer—we didn't have enough coal to heat it much. When they took the machines out, just lately, they said that was the reason—the trouble with the needles breaking. The boys have gone back to school now, but I don't know how we're goin' to keep them there, it's so hard to get along with only my husband working, and he only getting $2.25 a day down at the wagon factory. He works in the paint room where they dip wheels. He's been there three months; got only $1.50 a day at first. But those machines were awful worrisome things to have around. We're thinkin' about moving back to the farm down near ———; if we could get a start there the boys could help a lot with the work.

Another woman said:

My daughter recently married a man * * * and left the three stepchildren with me here. A——— works at the mill, B——— will be 11 next October and goes to school. C———, who will be 13 next May 5, used to work in the mill as knitter until about September 5, when she was turned off. Soon after, about the 10th, the mill people put in these three machines for C——— to run. She doesn't like the work and wants to go back to school. Two of the school-teachers have been around lately trying to get her to go back to school. I don't know how we'll get along without her help, though, with her earning $9.50 every two weeks.

The mill which installed the machines and furnished the home work in these two instances later transferred their knitting machines back to the mill. The managers said they had found it unsatisfactory, and until the question of whether the employment of children on home work in this way would affect their right to ship the product in interstate commerce had been settled they did not think it worth while to risk doing it.

A more detailed statement of the occupations at which children worked in the various mills and factories is given in the report of inspections made after June 3.

Rhode Island.

For several weeks prior to the date the Federal child-labor law of 1916 was declared unconstitutional, inspections were made in a number of establishments in Rhode Island. Seventeen mills engaged in the manufacture of cotton, woolen, and silk goods, and dyeing and finishing, located in four of the principal industrial centers, and three factories engaged in the manufacture of glass, electrical supplies, and jewelry, were inspected at this time.[84]

[84] After the law was declared unconstitutional it was decided that although some of the largest child-employing factories had been covered, it was desirable to complete the inspections planned for Rhode Island; so 37 inspections were made in four cities or towns, 32 of which inspections were in jewelry factories (most of them very small) in Providence. Altogether, 380 children under 16 years of age were found at work; 1 of these was 12, and 5 were 13 years of age.

The age minimum established by the State law was 14—the same as the Federal standard. In the course of 20 inspections, 12 children under 14 years of age were found at work. The State law provided that children between 14 and 16 years of age could not be employed in factories more than 10 hours a day, or 54 hours a week, or before 6 a. m. or after 8 p. m. The hours of work permitted under the State law were, therefore, distinctly longer than those under the Federal, and readjustments had to be made when the Federal act went into effect. In the course of the Federal inspections, 70 children employed in 16 establishments were found working more than 8 hours a day and more than 48 hours a week in violation of the Federal standard.[85] One child was working at night in violation of both Federal and State laws.

In the course of the inspections of the jewelry shops in Providence it was discovered that considerable work was being given out to be done in the homes. Some of the middlemen who gave out the work were visited, and also a few of the homes, where such work as stone setting, wiring beads, making rosaries, assembling parts of cuff buttons, bracelets, and other jewelry, and carding snap fasteners was being done. Usually the work was given out to adults, but in a number of instances the inspector found that material had been furnished children by a middleman, or representative of the factory. Children as young as 8 and 9 years were found helping their older sisters and brothers or parents on this work after school hours and in the evening.

Rhode Island was one of the States in which certificates issued under State authority were accepted for the purposes of the Federal act. The law required a certificate for every child between 14 and 16 years of age employed in any factory, manufacturing, or business establishment, and that a birth certificate, a baptismal certificate, or a passport should be accepted as proof of age in the order named. If none of these was obtainable, the decision as to what evidence should then be accepted was made by the secretary of the State board of education, who also supplied the forms for the issuing officer. When the Federal child-labor law went into effect, the board decided that the evidence required in regulation 2 of the Federal rules and regulations should be followed in the acceptance of other evidence of age by the secretary of the board. The educational minimum required by the law was ability to read and write English. Each applicant was required to present a certificate from an authorized physician stating that he was physically fit to work. The certificates were issued under the direction of the local school committee, and, as in

[85] When the Federal law was declared unconstitutional most of the Rhode Island employers at once returned to the longer working day permitted under the State law for children under 16 years of age. Thus, of the 389 children under 16 years of age who were found at work in the 37 establishments inspected after June 3, 317 were working 9 or 10 hours a day.

other States in which the authority to issue is so decentralized, the issuing of certificates was very much better done by some local school authorities than by others. In the larger towns the work was usually much better organized, with better methods of securing and filing records, than in the smaller towns, where frequently the issuing officer did so many kinds of work that he gave little thought or time to the certificating. Birth certificates could be secured for a large per cent of the children; but in some of the towns where the registrar charged a fee of 50 cents or a dollar for a certificate, the issuing officers did not ask that they be secured. In Providence a bound index of births arranged in alphabetical order was furnished the issuing officer, so that the evidence was always at hand. Of the 1,062 children under 16 years of age interviewed, there were no certificates on file for 85, and 19 of those filed were illegally or incorrectly issued.[86]

In checking up the ages of the children employed in the factories, the inspectors of the Child-Labor Division found that in some cases what appeared on its face to be excellent evidence of the child's age and had been so accepted by the issuing officer, gave the child's age incorrectly.

For example, one of the first inspections made in Rhode Island was a night inspection in a woolen mill, where a small force was at work. One small girl interviewed said she was over 16 years of age and was working 10 hours a day in a mill in an adjoining town, and doing overtime work at night to make extra money. Investigation proved the girl to be under 16; so, after the completion of this inspection, it was decided to inspect the mill in the neighboring town where this girl said she worked on the day force and had done overtime work occasionally. During this inspection an older sister, who said she was over 16, and a younger sister, who said she was 14, were interviewed. The ages of these children were investigated and documentary evidence of age was secured showing the older sister to be over 16 and the younger just 12 years of age. A return visit was made to the first mill and, on the request of the inspectors, the mill superintendent brought the three sisters to the office to be interviewed. When confronted with the facts, the two younger girls admitted that they had obtained their work permits on fraudulent baptismal certificates purchased from an Italian neighbor for $15 each. They further stated that a number of other children in the neighborhood had purchased these certificates in order to go to work before they were 14 years old. Investigation proved this statement to be true. A number of other children were found in this and in other factories who testified they had purchased baptismal certificates from this Italian for prices ranging from $5 to $20 each. Some of

[86] Of the 389 children under 16 years of age interviewed in the course of the inspections made after June 3, there were no certificates filed for 31 children, and 17 were illegally or incorrectly issued.

the children had paid for them on the installment plan after they had gone to work.

These certificates bore the seal of a large Italian church. Comparison with the bona fide records and seal of the church showed the language was the same, the paper bore the same water mark, but the seal (a rubber stamp) was a trifle larger and the type on it somewhat wider. One certificate bore the forged signature of a priest who had been in Italy for two years.

All this information was turned over to the local United States attorney and the Italian who had fraudulently issued the certificates was held on bail. Shortly after this the Federal child-labor law was declared unconstitutional, and the matter was dropped in consequence.

Another source of inaccurate records was discovered in the course of the Rhode Island inspections. The priest of an Italian church, who had disappeared suddenly and concerning whom various rumors were afloat, had issued statements of age on the official church stationery bearing the seal of the church, making the birth date of the children earlier than that recorded for them on the church register, and had also issued statements of age for children who had been baptized in other Catholic churches.

In the towns visited, the authorities encouraged the registration of births of children by parents who had not registered them at the time the children were born. Corroborative documentary evidence was not required when these entries were made; and some parents, discovering this fact, registered their children as older than they were in fact, and then secured a certified record of the registration and straightway presented it to the issuing officer for a work permit. In tracing back the records the Federal inspectors found that several of these children had been previously registered under a slightly different spelling, but the clerk had not discovered the fact and had made the second entry without question. Under these circumstances a birth certificate becomes of little value as evidence of age.

South Carolina.

South Carolina was one of the States in which Federal certificates of age were issued. It was among the first of the southern textile States to attempt to control child labor, and a small staff of factory inspectors had been regularly employed in the enforcement of the State law. At the time the Federal child-labor law went into effect it was below the Federal standard only in that it permitted the 10-hour day or the 60-hour week for children from 14 to 16 years of age.

In the spring of 1918, Federal inspectors visited 36 towns or cities and made inspections of 64 establishments—60 were engaged in the manufacture of cotton, hosiery, and knit goods; 1 was a glass factory; 1 made paper goods; 1 manufactured optical goods; and 1 was engaged in the manufacture of fertilizers.

Altogether, 20 children under 14 years of age were employed in violation of State and Federal standards in 9 of the 64 establishments inspected before June 3; 12 of these 20 children were working in 7 textile mills, and 6 in 1 glass factory. In 16 of the 64 factories inspected, a total of 48 children under 16 years of age were working more than 8 hours a day, and 1 was employed after 7 p. m. Of the 1,510 children under 16 years of age found at work, there were no Federal certificates on file for 243. It will be remembered that State certificates were required by the State law; and that because State certificates were issued on parents' affidavits, Federal certificates had been issued in South Carolina ever since the law went into effect. As a matter of course, the officers of the Child-Labor Division inspected all factories which were not procuring Federal certificates for their children. In a few places, State as well as Federal certificates were kept on file, but in general employers were of the opinion, in spite of explanations to the contrary, that State certificates were unnecessary if Federal ones were procured.

Some inspections (24 factories) were made in South Carolina after the Federal law was declared unconstitutional. While all the children employed had been changed from the 8- to the 10-hour day, the age minimum was being very generally observed.[87] The commissioner of agriculture, commerce, and labor was requiring proof of age in addition to parents' affidavits in many cases before certificates were issued; and at a few factories, where notaries employed by the factory were taking the affidavits of parents, they were requiring additional proof of age. Beyond the increase in the length of the day, which is very serious for young children, no general letting down of standards was discovered after the Federal act was declared unconstitutional.

Tennessee.

The standards of the Tennessee child-labor law were substantially the same as those of the Federal law, and a certificating law passed in 1917 required the evidence of age recommended in the letter sent to the governors[88] by the Child-Labor Board (Attorney General, Secretary of Labor, and Secretary of Commerce). Certificates were issued by the schools, and the enforcement of the law was given to the chief inspector of workshops and factories and his deputies.

In April, May, and June, 1918, 61 factories situated in 13 cities and towns were inspected by the Child-Labor Division. Except Nashville, all these cities and towns were located in the eastern part of the State. A number of different types of industries were covered, but the largest number, 29, were textile factories. Altogether, 688

[87] Only two children under 14 were found employed.

[88] See pp. 16–17.

children under 16 years of age were found employed, and 579 of that number were working in textile mills.

Ten children under 14 years of age were found at work prior to June 3 in violation of the State and Federal age standards. One was in a cotton mill, 2 in hosiery mills, 5 in the manufacture of stoves and hot-air furnaces, and 2 in an agricultural implement factory.

In 21 factories, 50 children were employed more than 8 hours a day, and in 2 stove factories 14 children were working after 7 p. m. Two of these latter were under 14 years of age. They came to the foundry at 3 p. m., but in order to finish the jobs they sometimes worked as late as 10 o'clock at night; other children were working until 11 o'clock. One was employed by a molder for $2.10 a week, and another by a sand cutter for $3 a week. Although the manager knew these young children were brought in to work after school hours, he claimed that he was not responsible for any violation, as he neither employed nor paid the children—although both State and Federal law were explicit on this point.

Children in textile mills were employed in the usual occupations of spinning, doffing, weaving, winding, sweeping, knitting, looping, mating, boarding (stockings), cleaning, burling, messenger service, etc.

In the manufacture of tobacco they were rolling, twisting, racking, and tagging; in the manufacture of clothing they were operating machines, trimming threads, sewing buttons, matching, pairing, and working in errand service. In foundry work they were acting as sand cutters and helpers, shaking and rapping out castings, trimming up castings, etc. No unusual jobs were noted except in a railroad repair shop, where 8 boys under 16 years of age were working 10⅓ hours a day, 58 hours a week, heating rivets.

Of the 688 children under 16 years of age, certificates were on file for 611; of these, 36 were irregularly issued, and 5 were for children who were under 14 years of age. In Tennessee the school officials in the towns visited evidenced a desire to live up to the law; and in view of the fact that the law had been so recently enacted, the irregularities or misunderstandings were few in number. There was in Tennessee a lack of that uniformity in the interpretation of the certificating law which can be secured only if a State officer is given supervisory authority.

Virginia.

In September, 1917, Virginia was designated for a period of six months as a State in which certificates issued under State authority should be accepted for the purposes of the Federal act—which meant that if State certificates had been issued for children who were under 14, the employer would be protected against prosecution. Under the State law certificates were issued by notaries on the following

evidence of age: (*a*) Birth certificate; (*b*) passport or baptismal certificate; (*c*) other documentary evidence or a school census or school record, in the discretion of the issuing officer; (*d*) in case documentary evidence was not procurable, a parent's affidavit. That the system would be weakened by intrusting it to a notary public was feared, especially as the notaries who issued the certificates could be employees of the factory.

The inspections made in the autumn of 1917 [89] showed that Virginia certificates could not be relied upon for the purposes of the Federal act. At this time 57 factories were inspected, including cotton, silk, knit goods, and hosiery mills; boots and shoes; tile and glass; tobacco, paper-bag, and basket factories, as well as a number of others. The total number of children under 16 years of age found at work was 807. Certificates were on file for 634 of these children, but 476 of them had been illegally or incorrectly issued, and their acceptance for the purposes of the Federal act was revoked.

While a notary employed by a factory should under no circumstances be clothed with the authority to issue certificates which will keep his employer from prosecution, interviews with notaries in the Virginia cities in which inspections were made showed that those not connected with the factories were usually entirely ignorant of the requirements of the law; and when the law was explained to them, they felt they could not afford, for the 50 cents or $1 fee charged for a certificate, to spend the time for the necessary investigation of the proof of age. On the other hand, a number of notaries employed by the factory were found to be issuing with some degree of care, and both they and their employers were ready to follow regulation 2 of the Federal rules and regulations in accepting evidence of age. As already explained, it was decided after much consideration that the only remedy for the Virginia situation was to issue Federal certificates, and this was begun in May, 1918.

Violations of the Federal child-labor law were discovered in 26 factories in the course of Virginia inspections. There were 52 children under 14 years of age, and 48 between 14 and 16 years of age who were working more than eight hours a day, and 7 who were working after 7 p. m. and before 6 a. m.

West Virginia.

West Virginia had provided in its State law that children under 14 should not be employed in factories or manufacturing establishments, but the hours of work for children between 14 and 16 years of age were not restricted. In reference to certificates or work permits, it belonged to the group of States which was below the Federal standard in the evidence which the statute said should be

[89] Inspections were made of Virginia canneries and of a number of other industries after June 3, 1918, and a few mines were inspected prior to that date. These are discussed in other sections of the report.

accepted as proof of age.[90] It was designated as a State in which certificates issued under the State authority should be accepted for the purposes of the Federal act because little was known of the actual way in which the certificate was being issued, and because an elastic clause in the child-labor law of West Virginia [91] made it possible for the school authorities who were charged with the responsibility of issuing certificates to require the evidence of age prescribed in the Federal regulations. It was therefore believed that, with the cooperation of State officials and local superintendents of schools, what was an unsatisfactory law might be made reasonably satisfactory in administration.

Some special interest was attached to the enforcement of the law in West Virginia because, at the conference of State officials held in July, the commissioner of labor for West Virginia expressed the opinion that the enforcement of the law would be impossible because of the military draft and the increasing demand for labor in war industries.[92] This was not the view of the other State officers present. It had been urged upon Congress, however, especially by those who had opposed the enactment of the law during peace times. But Congress refused to modify the law; and those immediately responsible for the prosecution of the war took the position that the employment of very young children for long hours was dangerous to the future welfare of the country, and, moreover, that the experience of England and France had shown it was unwise from the standpoint of production.

The conference met during the fourth month after the United States entered the war, when many people were urging that "business as usual" should be the rule, and that labor for the munition factories and shipyards would have to be found, not by curtailment of nonessential industries, but by bringing in a hitherto unused supply of women and children. Whether this view was any more general in West Virginia than in other States can not be said. Business men everywhere soon realized that it was untenable.

---

[90] Law required school records showing ability to read and write simple sentences in English, and the equivalent of a fourth-grade education. Proof of age was either a passport or school census record showing the date and place of birth, or in case neither of these was accessible an affidavit of the parent made before the issuing officer. The West Virginia law was amended and greatly strengthened by the legislature in 1919.

[91] This provision was as follows: "No employment certificate shall be issued until the child in question has personally appeared before the officer issuing the certificate, nor until such officer has satisfied himself * * * that the child is 14 years of age or upwards and has reached the normal development of a child of its age * * * . In all cases of doubt such development * * * shall be determined by a medical officer of the board or department of health, or by a physician appointed by the school board."

[92] "Under existing conditions," he said, "it is doubtful whether the standard of employment affecting child labor can be raised at this time. No matter how active the Federal and State child-labor bureaus may be, we must be sustained by a healthy public sentiment to make the Federal act effective. It takes more than alert and faithful officers to convict transgressors. You must have juries who are in sympathy with your objects. * * * It is safe to say that every normal child 14 years of age is employed in some needful industry or occupation in England France or Germany."

Inspections were made in 70 factories in West Virginia during the fall of 1917 and the spring of 1918.[93] A total of 13 children under 14 years of age were found employed in 12 different factories, 8 of which were glass factories. Violations of the hour standards were much more common—about half the factories inspected (32) were employing children under 16 years of age more than eight hours a day. The total number of children thus employed was 139, and 103 of these were in glass factories. With many of the latter the violation was a technical misunderstanding of the regulations. As is customary in glass factories in most parts of the country, the employees in West Virginia were usually given a rest period of 15 minutes both in the morning and in the afternoon. This the management counted as "time off." Under regulation 6 of the Federal rules and regulations only "a single continuous period" was to be counted as time off, so these children were recorded on the inspector's report as working eight and one-half hours a day. In a few factories children for whom affidavits were on file showing them to be 16 years of age, and who were proved to be younger, were working full time. However, these explanations do not cover all the children found working overtime, and they do not explain the 7 children, 6 of them employed in glass factories, who were working at night.

All the inspectors who worked in West Virginia reported that the most serious drawback to the enforcement of both the Federal and State laws was the certificating system. One of the first sources of confusion was the fact that the law provided that the county superintendent of schools, or any one authorized by him, could issue employment certificates. In one district the mayors of all the towns, the superintendents of nine school districts, the principals of the various schools, as well as the truant and probation officers, had all been authorized by the county superintendent to issue certificates, and most of them were using the authority given them. Children who failed to get a certificate from one official could usually succeed with a second. Thus, in one town when a child was refused a certificate by the city superintendent because he could not meet the educational standard of the State law, he applied to the county superintendent, who granted a certificate without any investigation. In most cities and towns there were no records as to numbers of certificates issued or refused, or evidence of age required. The statute made no provision for vacation certificates, but in some communities it had been customary to issue them to children under 14 years of age, although this was clearly contrary to the law. One county superintendent had decided that no certificates were required when schools were not in session. Another source of difficulty was that

[93] Some inspections were made in West Virginia during the summer of 1918, when investigations of the Ohio glass factories and potteries were being made. These are discussed in connection with the report on Ohio inspections pp. 128–129.

in towns along the Ohio border children often lived in Ohio and worked in West Virginia.[94]

A certificate was supposed to be returned by the employer to the issuing officer when the child left his employment, but with the number of issuing officers, this provision was difficult of enforcement. Under the circumstances it was perhaps not surprising that the certificate requirement was frequently disregarded by employers. In one town, the truant officer reported that a number of the employers, just prior to September 1, when the Federal law went into effect, had checked up all the children in their employ who were under 16, had procured certificates for all those for whom it was possible, and had dismissed all children for whom certificates could not be procured. Many of these new certificates had been very carelessly granted under a "rush order" from the local manufacturers.

The school officers were in general much interested in the prevention of child labor, but either they had not appreciated the importance of the certificating system, or in the general confusion of authority had not felt responsible for its improvement.

During the inspections made in the autumn of 1917, out of 632 children under 16 years of age who were found at work no certificates were on file for 180. The acceptance of 96 certificates found on file was revoked for the purpose of the Federal act. It was quite apparent during these first inspections that unless conditions were improved it would be necessary to issue Federal certificates in the State.

In February, 1918, after a series of conferences brought about by the commissioner of labor with the State superintendent of free schools, the State inspector of mines, the State manufacturers' association, and a number of local school superintendents, a letter was sent by the State superintendent to the county superintendents of schools instructing them to withdraw all previous authorizations to issue certificates of age, and in the future to limit this authority to one person in each town, instructing this person to issue certificates in accordance with regulation 2 of the Federal rules and regulations. The Children's Bureau agreed to have an inspector spend some time in the State explaining the requirements and the kinds of records which should be kept. In order to test out the success of this plan before refusing to redesignate West Virginia, the designation was extended for a three-months period. It proved to be not sufficient time to accomplish the desired ends, and the question of what action should be taken was pending when the law was declared unconstitutional.

[94] This is discussed more fully in connection with the Ohio report, pp. 128–129.

INSPECTION OF MINES.

The case against the employment of young children in mines has been established. Since 1842, when the first report of the Children's Employment Commission of Great Britain revealed hideous conditions in the coal mines of that country, an increasingly large public throughout the world has said that children must not be employed in mines. The Federal child-labor act of 1916 prohibited the shipment in interstate or foreign commerce of the products of any mine or quarry in which children under 16 years of age had been employed within 30 days prior to the removal of such products therefrom. The State age minimum was the same, or higher, in all the mining States important from a child-labor standpoint except Indiana, Iowa, Missouri, Virginia, and West Virginia. The total number of children employed in the mines was not large for the United States as a whole, but in mining sections there was reason to believe the numbers were large.

In general the enforcement of State laws with reference to the employment of children in mines has been left to the mining inspectors. This practice has commended itself to many because it was assumed that there would be an unnecessary duplication of work if child-labor inspectors enforced the law. It should be remembered, however, that the mine inspector is, in theory at least, especially trained for the highly technical work of safety inspections. He has no professional interest in child-labor inspection. Most of the time of a child-labor inspector must be spent, not inside mines and factories, but in outside investigation of the ages of the children. It is quite wasteful of the skill of a safety engineer to plan that he shall spend time in visits to certificating offices, homes, health departments, etc., in order to establish the age of a child. That most mine inspectors will not give the necessary time for this work is to be expected.

The 1910 Census, which contains the latest available figures, showed 18,695 children under 16 years of age employed in the "extraction of minerals." Most of them, 15,505, were working in or about coal mines, 9,220 being classified as laborers, 3,374 as breaker hands, and 1,601 as door tenders. There were eight States, according to the census figures, in each of which more than 500 children under 16 years of age were working in selected occupations in mines or quarries—Pennsylvania, 8,224; West Virginia, 1,839; Alabama, 1,419; Tennessee, 851; Ohio, 840; Kentucky, 690; Virginia, 621; and Indiana, 585.[95] Laws and administration have changed since 1910, so these figures are probably no longer typical.

Because of the meager information on hand it was necessary to make the initial work of the Child-Labor Division largely an investi-

[95] Compiled from Thirteenth Census of the United States, 1910, Vol. IV, Tables VI and VII.

gation of where inspections should be made. The first surveys of the field were made in the Kentucky, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia coal fields. Some regular inspections [96] were made in all these states except Tennessee. Inspections were made also in Pennsylvania, and after June 3 in Indiana.

Prior to 1909 Pennsylvania had prohibited the employment of children under 16 years of age in the mines, but the only kind of certificate required was the parent's affidavit, and in consequence the law did not keep children under that age out of the mines. In 1909 the law was amended so as to require documentary proof of the child's age, but it is reported that "through an unfortunate error in drafting the bill" [97] the minimum age was reduced to 14 years for employment inside the anthracite mines. This was amended in 1915, so that at the time the Federal law went into effect no minor under 16 years of age could be legally employed or permitted to work "in any anthracite or bituminous coal mine or in any other mine." While the Pennsylvania act provided for the enforcement of this and all other sections of the State child-labor law by the commissioner of labor and industry, the inspection of the mines was left to the department of mines. The "breakers" in the anthracite coal region were not regarded as "in the mine" within the meaning of the Pennsylvania law; and regular inspections of the breakers, with a view to the enforcement of the child-labor law, had not been made by either department. The Federal rules and regulations contemplated including breakers as part of the mines,[98] but there had been no judicial determination of the matter.

On the initiative of the acting commissioner of labor and industry a conference of representatives of the Child-Labor Division and the officials of the State departments of labor and industry, and of mines, was held at Harrisburg in March, 1918, and it was decided to make some joint inspections in the Scranton-Wilkes-Barre anthracite fields. The work was in progress when the act was declared unconstitutional, and it was continued for a few weeks after June 3.[99] In all of these inspections violations of the Federal standards were found. Altogether 194 children under 16 years of age were found at work. Of this number 12 were under 14 years of age. There were 26 children under 16 years of age working inside the mines—as door trappers, drivers of mules, and as assistant to the armature winder—in violation of both State and Federal standards.

---

[96] See Appendix I, Table J, p. 172, for summary of children under 16 years of age found employed in the course of these inspections.

[97] Lovejoy, Owen R.: "The Coal Mines of Pennsylvania," in Uniform Child Labor Laws (Proceedings of the Seventh Annual Conference on Child Labor, 1911). National Child Labor Committee, p. 135. New York, 1911

[98] See Appendix II, Regulation 1, p. 76. Certificates were to be issued "for children between 16 and 17 years of age when employment in or about a mine or quarry" was contemplated.

[99] Prior to that date 15 inspections of mines and breakers were made, and after that date inspections of two mines and four breakers were made in Pennsylvania.

The employment of young children as slate pickers in the breakers is an old established custom. As the coal is brought out of the mines in cars it is dumped into cylinders, where it is crushed. From the cylinders it is carried down to the railroad cars on "breaker belts," and the boys clean the coal by picking out the slate and rock as the coal rushes past them. As it is usually cleaned dry, the dust that rises envelops the breakers and often the town in darkness. In danger of accidents and constantly exposed to obstructive and irritating dust, there is no more forlorn group of child laborers than these breaker boys.

The hours of work of children over 16 employed in mines were not regulated either by the State law or indirectly by the Federal law. It is of interest, however, that in the mines where the 8-hour day is common for adults the boys who were mule drivers had to be on duty a half hour earlier in the morning and a half hour later at night in order to care for the mules. In mines where the working day was more than 8 hours the drivers' hours were correspondingly longer. Under the interpretation of the State law, followed by the State officials, children between 14 and 16 years of age were permitted to work on breakers, but they could not be legally so employed more than 51 hours in any one week, or more than 9 hours in any one day, or before 6 in the morning or after 8 in the evening. If the breaker was held not to be a mine within the terms of the Federal act, the hours must be limited to 8 hours a day, 48 hours a week, and between 6 a. m. and 7 p. m. The hours these children worked was therefore a matter of technical as well as general interest. The breaker children frequently worked until late at night "recleaning" coal that had been condemned. The inspector found one boy who stated that he had been so employed until 2.30 in the morning, and the pay check of a 13-year-old breaker boy showed 128 hours of work for the first half of March.

In general the provisions of the Pennsylvania law with reference to the issuance of certificates of age were good. The law required certificates for all children between 14 and 16 years of age employed in any occupation except agriculture and domestic service. They were issued by the local school superintendent or some one authorized by him. The evidence of age required was practically that of regulation 2 of the rules and regulations. In addition, proof of completion of the sixth grade in school and a certificate of physical fitness from an authorized physician were required. Whenever the State superintendent of public instruction could not secure effective enforcement of these provisions of the law, the law required him to report to the State board of education, and the board could then appoint attendance officers for the district. Still, in some of the mining towns the system was not working.

There were no certificates on file for 30.4 per cent of the children under 16 years of age employed about these mines in Pennsylvania, and of those on file 20 per cent had been so irregularly issued that they constituted a protection to employers in the violation of the law. For example, in one town visited, a superintendent of schools who had recently been removed had made a practice of selling certificates to under-age children, and certificates issued by him were found both inside and outside the district in which he had taught. Most of these children were two years younger than the age given on the certificate. In another town parents, most of them Polish and Slovak immigrants, made affidavit that they had paid fees to secure certificates from the superintendent. Thus, the parents of a boy of 12 paid only 50 cents for a certificate showing him to be 14 years of age while for another 12-year-old boy a fee of $5 had been collected.[100] In another family the payment had been $1 for a vacation permit and $2 for a general certificate. Apparently the theory of the principal was to charge all that the traffic would bear. A supervising principal who had 32 widely scattered schools in his district was a justice of the peace and notary public as well. He had an office in the rear room of a saloon which he used for issuing certificates and transacting his business as justice of the peace. The room was very dirty and the records in great confusion. What he described as baptismal certificates had been accepted for a considerable number of children, although, as the certificates presented clearly stated, they were in fact merely the parent's statement of the child's age to the priest. Parents' affidavits and school records were accepted by some superintendents, although this was prohibited by the State law.

Such disregard of the State law was not found in all the mining towns visited. In some, the superintendent was carefully examining all applicants, and the law was being well administered in the face of considerable local opposition and occasionally in spite of the efforts of the school committees to break down the law.

The West Virginia law prohibited the employment of all females and all boys under 14 years [1] of age, and of boys between 14 and 16 years of age during the school session, in mines employing five or more people in a 24-hour period. However, in the mining towns of that State the school term was often only six months, so boys between 14 and 16 could work in the mines six months a year.

The West Virginia law did not require the same employment certificate for these children that had to be procured for children under 16 years of age employed in factories. During the school term the mine operator had to keep on file for each boy employed a parent's affidavit that he was 16 years of age, and, during the vacation period, that he was 14 years of age or over. Duplicates of these affidavits

[100] In the canvass a 13-year-old girl was also found whose parents had paid $5 for a certificate saying she was 16 years of age.

[1] The age was raised to 16 in 1919.

were to be filed with the district mine inspectors of the State, who had power to prohibit the employment of the children in hazardous places. These certificating provisions made a very poor basis for the enforcement of the Federal act; and in the conferences [2] with reference to the acceptance of certificates issued under the State law for the purposes of the Federal act, the certificates for children in mines was much discussed.

Eight of the nine coal mines inspected in West Virginia were violating the Federal standards. There were 15 children under 16 years of age working inside the mines as trapper boys (opening and closing doors), and in tending switches, coupling cars, and even as miners, picking out coal and loading cars. While the inspectors were at work in the State a boy was seriously crippled in one mine, and in another a colored trapper boy—who was in fact 15 years old, but whose mother had made affidavit that he was 16 years of age—was run over by a car. The company surgeon said his examination showed that the boy's skull was fractured, the scalp badly lacerated, the right leg from the knee down badly lacerated, and that three fingers had been amputated. The boy did not live long, and one of the officials, taking advantage of the "Fuel will win the war" slogan, said: "The boy has died for his country."

The Indiana inspections were all made after the United States child-labor law was declared unconstitutional. The law in that State permitted the employment of a boy of 14 in mines if he had a miner's permit, issued by the county miner's examining board, stating age, nativity, and residence, or if he worked with a qualified miner. The child-labor law provided that no child under 16 could be employed in any occupation while school was in session without an employment certificate issued by the school authorities. For these school certificates completion of the fifth grade in school as well as proof that the child was 14 years of age or over was required. The enforcement of all laws with reference to mines was the duty of the inspector of mines.

In the course of the inspections in Indiana, 6 children under 14, and 56 children between 14 and 16 years of age, were found at work in the mines. Of these 62 children under 16 years of age, 25 were working without miner's permits, and only 1 had a school certificate. The inspections were begun in July and were completed after the schools opened. The dates on the miners' permits indicated that the children under 16 who were found in the mines during the vacation season, and for whom no school certificates were on file, had gone to work before the schools closed; a few had been at work more than a year. Mine superintendents were generally ignorant of the fact that school certificates were required. After school began the inspections resulted in the dismissal of the children who could not pass the age and educational tests for school certificates.

---

[2] See p. 81.

PART II. INSPECTIONS MADE FROM JUNE 3, 1918, TO APRIL 25, 1919.

When the United States child-labor act was held unconstitutional on June 3, 1918, the issuing of certificates of age in Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Mississippi was discontinued, and many of the inspections that were planned, and some that were in progress, were abandoned. The law establishing the Children's Bureau directs that it shall, among other things, investigate and report on "dangerous occupations, accidents and diseases of children, employment, [and] legislation affecting children in the several States and Territories." Acting under this authority, inspections were made by the Child-Labor Division of the bureau in a number of States after June 3. Those made in Maryland, North Carolina, Ohio, and Virginia are especially important. These and some made in Arkansas, Florida, Kentucky, Massachusetts, and New York have been summarized.[3] Following this is a discussion of the adoption of the child-labor clause for war contracts and the special inspections made of establishments engaged in war work.

The work of the division was discontinued when the Federal child-labor tax law went into effect on April 25, 1919, and its administration was begun by the Child-Labor Tax Division of the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

To prevent repetition, the expression "Federal age and hour standards" is used with reference to the inspections made after June 3 throughout the discussion and in the tables. While the United States child-labor act of September 1, 1916, had been declared unconstitutional, Congress had adopted, and the President had approved, the principle that in mines or quarries no child under 16 should be employed, and that in mills, canneries, workshops, factories, or manufacturing establishments no child under 14 should be employed, and no child between 14 and 16 years of age should be employed more than 8 hours a day, or 6 days a week, or before 6 a. m., or after 7 p. m. Except for the provision with reference to mines and quarries, the same age and hour standards were adopted by the War Labor Policies Board for insertion in all war contracts. They were therefore quite rightly spoken of by State inspectors and the general public as the Federal standards.

[3] See Appendix I, Table I, for number of children under 16 years of age employed in violation of State and Federal standards in the course of these inspections.

As in the other inspections, special attention was given to the way in which the employment certificates were issued. Many of these inspections were made during the summer of 1918, when schools were closed and school officials often out of town. In some places this accounted for the unsatisfactory and often illegal way in which the certificates were being issued. This is a recurring condition for which definite provision must be made. In some States the special vacation permits demoralized the issuing offices. Generally speaking, the vacation-permit plan has been found a dangerous one from the standpoint of the children. The experience of many States shows that it is extremely difficult to call in the temporary certificates when school opens, and the effect of the measure must be, in consequence, a lowering of educational standards. But entirely apart from the effect on school attendance, the vacation permits are undesirable. Child-labor laws are not alone to reinforce compulsory-education laws. The physical hazards of premature employment are almost as serious as the educational hazards. It should be remembered that industry is not organized either for recreation or training, and it is therefore no more suited to meet the needs of the children in summer than in winter.

SECTION I. GENERAL INSPECTIONS.

Arkansas.

The Arkansas child-labor act prohibited the employment of a child under 14 "in any remunerative occupation," except that during vacation a child under 14 years of age could be employed by his parents or guardian in an occupation owned or controlled by them. The compulsory-education law required school attendance from 7 to 15 years of age, unless the child had completed the seventh grade in school, was physically or mentally incapacitated, or his services were necessary for the support of a widowed mother. The child-labor law made no such exemptions for children under 14 years of age. The hours of work for children between 14 and 16 years of age were the same as those fixed by the Federal act. There was in addition a long list of dangerous occupations in which children under 16 could not be employed, and the State board of health could after hearings extend the list.

Although Arkansas was not an important manufacturing State, it was none the less important that the measures it had taken for the protection of its children should be carefully carried out. However, only one inspector had been provided, and it was therefore not surprising to find that many plants had never been inspected. Two inspections were made in Arkansas by the Child-Labor Division prior to June 3. Those made after that date included 36 factories distributed in 17 localities. These factories were principally manufacturing lumber products—staves, barrel headings, hickory handles, hardwood flooring, boxes, veneers, etc. A yarn mill, a cotton-duck mill, a sausage factory, a candy and paper-box factory, and a large picric-acid factory were also inspected.

In the 36 factories inspected, 258 children under 16 years of age were employed. Of that number, 117 were under 14 years of age, 3 were only 9 years of age, 10 were 10, 17 were 11, 32 were 12, and 55 were 13 years of age. There were 194 children under 16 years of age employed more than 8 hours a day. All these were so employed in violation of the State law as well as the Federal standards.

Employment certificates were issued by the local superintendent or principal of the public school, or by the commissioner of labor and statistics, or by some person authorized by either. The commissioner of labor and statistics had authority to revoke any employment certificate issued in violation of the laws and so could exercise general supervision over the work done by the local officers. The law passed in 1917 at the suggestion of the Federal Child-Labor Board[4] provided

[4] See p. 17, footnote 14.

that the person authorized to issue an employment certificate could prescribe, and from time to time change, the regulations with reference to the proof of age, provided that such regulations should substantially comply with the Federal regulations.

As soon as the Federal rules and regulations were adopted, forms were prepared by the commissioner and sent out to local officers. The instructions to physicians in connection with the physician's certificate of age used in the issuance of Federal certificates were also approved by the commissioner and sent out to the local issuing officers.

In spite of these efforts, the law with reference to certificates was little understood or its importance appreciated. The commissioner did not investigate reports sent in by the local superintendents. He reported that he had never had reason to believe that the evidence was manufactured or altered by children below the legal age so as to enable them to get certificates. His records showed that the evidence most frequently accepted was the Bible record. The real difficulty was that manufacturers were employing children without certificates, entirely regardless of the law. The commissioner estimated that certificates had been issued for not more than 50 per cent of the children between 14 and 16 years of age employed in factories. The inspections made by the Child-Labor Division indicated a larger per cent. Of the 141 children between those ages found at work, there were no certificates on file for 125. Some firms were relying on parent's affidavits, which they secured for the children they employed. One manufacturer prepared the affidavits for the parent's signature and sent them home by the child to be signed. Sixteen was the age always given in this form. Signing was regarded as necessary to get the job, so sometimes the parent and sometimes the child signed it, and then it was returned to the employer.

During the summer of 1918, the commissioner reported that, with the approval of the governor and the State council of defense, he had begun the practice of granting special vacation permits to children from 10 to 14 years of age. He reported that 150 such certificates had been issued from June 1 to July 13, 1918. The employment of these children was clearly prohibited by the State law. The permit served merely as an assurance to the employer that the commissioner would not institute proceedings against firms employing children under 14 years of age, provided such certificates were secured. The plan was adopted as a war measure and because those in authority were impressed with the injustice of the law permitting children under 14 years of age to work during the vacation season only when they were employed by their parents. At almost the same time that this measure was decided in Arkansas to be necessary, those immediately responsible for the prosecution of the war had taken the

position that maximum production could not be secured through the employment of young children for an excessive number of hours, and that incalculable harm would be done to the country if the enforcement of the child-labor laws was relaxed.[5]

Florida.

During the winter and spring of 1918 inspections were made in Florida in 13 cigar factories, 1 cigar-box factory, 1 cracker factory, and 12 shipyards. The cigar factories were inspected at the request of the State factory inspector, and all these and a number of the shipyard inspections were made in cooperation with him.

The Florida child-labor law provided that no child under 14 years of age might be employed in manufacturing establishments, and that children between 14 and 16 might not work in manufacturing establishments for more than 9 hours a day, nor more than 54 hours a week, nor more than 6 days a week, nor between the hours of 8 p. m. and 5 a. m. Children were found employed in violation of these standards in 7 cigar factories, 1 cigar-box factory, and 5 shipyards.

Thirty-one children under 16 were found working in the tobacco factories, two of whom were found to be 13, one 12, and one 9 years old. The occupations in which the greater number of children were employed were rolling, cigar making, stripping, bunching, and learning certain of these occupations.

Occupations which involve the handling of tobacco have been regarded very generally as injurious to the health of young persons, as is shown by the special restrictions placed by 15 States upon the employment of minors in cigar factories or in other places where tobacco is manufactured or handled.[6] No such specific provision is contained in the Florida child-labor law, although the employment of children under 16 is forbidden in a number of other specified occupations, and also in "any occupation dangerous or injurious to health or morals, or to lives or limbs." Work in cigar factories has never been considered by the State authorities as coming under this latter provision, except so far as children are employed where machinery is in operation.

The absence of satisfactory time records in many of the factories inspected made it difficult, and in some cases impossible, to determine the actual hours the children worked. In factories in which all work was paid for on a piece basis no time records were kept at all, the books showing only the number of cigars made by the individual workers. These factories are usually open from 7 a. m. to 5 or 6 p. m., which made possible a working day of 10 or 11 hours. Twelve of the 30 children under 16 found at work in these establishments stated that they worked full time, and their statements were

[5] See p. 13, and pp. 133–134.
[6] See p. 39, footnote 11.

in general confirmed by the superintendent or other adults working in the same plant.

As a result of the evidence secured in these inspections, prosecutions for violation of the State child-labor law with respect to age, hours, and employment certificates were filed in the criminal court by the State factory inspector against 7 cigar factories. One boy of 12 was found working as "varnish boy" in the cigar-box factory inspected, and prosecution was filed against this concern also.

According to the State factory inspector's interpretation of the dangerous-occupation clause of the State child-labor law, the employment of children under 16, except as office boys or messengers, is forbidden in shipyards, as in any other plants where machinery is running. In consequence, not many boys under 16 were found working in the shipyards at the time of the Federal inspections, except in the exempted occupations. A few were employed in the sawmills connected with the wood-ship yards. Of the 18 boys found at work on the steel ships, only 7 were occupied in regular shipbuilding processes, such as the heating and passing of rivets, and an even smaller number were found at work in such occupations on the wooden ships. That a much larger number of children had previously been employed in the shipbuilding occupations, at least in some of the steel yards, is indicated by the statement made by the manager of one plant in which 5 boys under 16 were found employed. Because, it was said, of a communication from the State factory inspector relative to the exclusion of boys under 16 from the regular shipbuilding processes, one of the officials of this plant made an investigation into the ages of all the children claiming to be over 16 years who were working on parent's affidavits. As a result of this inquiry 40 boys were found to be under age and discharged. During the succeeding month, some 50 additional children who claimed to be 16 were laid off because they were found to be under age.

Children under 14 were found employed in two steel and in three wood-ship yards. About half the total number under 16 years of age, including three children of 13, three of 11, and one of 10, were working in one wood-ship yard. While most of these children were employed as sawmill hands, the child of 10 was a water boy and was obliged to journey to and fro through the yard and to climb all over the boats with his water can. In another yard a boy of 13 was employed carrying oakum to the calkers. When seen at work by the inspector, this child was carrying a 50-pound load up the scaffolding nearly to the top of an almost completed ship.

Although longer hours had been customary in some of the shipyards during the war, all were running on an 8-hour basis at the time of the inspections. Satisfactory time records were found in all but two of the yards, and there was no evidence that children were working for

more than the 8-hour day except in the sawmill connected with one of the wood-ship yards, in which 20 boys, including 7 under 14 years of age, were employed for 10 hours a day.

Less regard was paid to the requirements of the employment-certificate law in the tobacco factories and shipyards than in the canneries inspected while the Federal child-labor law was in operation.[7] Of the 80 children under 16 found at work in the course of the later inspections, there were active certificates on file for only 3. A number of children were working on certificates or affidavits stating their age as 16 or over who were found on investigation to be two or more years younger than the age claimed.

There was no uniformity in the method of issuing certificates in the different parts of the State, but a general lack of conformity with the requirements of the law. No attempt appeared to be made to secure birth records or other reliable documentary evidence as proof of age, as provided in the State regulations. Even school records were not available, as they were usually destroyed by the individual teachers at the end of each school term, and the parent's affidavit was almost universally relied upon as the sole proof of age.

Employers in general were found to be unaware of or willing to ignore the certificate requirements. In one small sawmill town, where wooden boats were built, 23 children under 16 were found at work, some of them as young as 10 and 11 years. None of these children, the majority of whom were working 10 hours a day, had certificates on file. Most of them, however, had furnished their employer with an affidavit from one of their parents, and these had been sufficient to secure their positions without further question, regardless of size, physical fitness, or education. In another town the superintendent of public instruction stated that no certificates had been required by the management of the local shipbuilding company, a large steel plant, until they had been informed by the State inspector that under the dangerous occupation clause of the child-labor law children under 16 must be excluded from shipbuilding occupations. This company had then asked to have the younger children who were being discharged as a result of this ruling given certificates, in order that they might have legal proof of the children's age to produce when necessary. A number of employers, who had not previously recognized the value of certificates, sent the children in their employ to be certificated as a result of the Federal inspections.

Kentucky.

Inspections were made in Kentucky in October and November, 1918, at the request of the woman State labor inspector, who was especially charged with the enforcement of the child-labor law in the

[7] See pp 61–62.

Louisville district. The age and hour standards of the Kentucky child-labor law were practically the same as those of the Federal law. In 1918 the law had been amended so that the proof of age required for certificates would meet the requirements of the Federal board. The Kentucky law also fixed an educational minimum of completion of the fifth grade in school and attendance of not less than 100 days during the 12 months prior to the date of application or of the fourteenth birthday of the applicant. The statute also enumerated a number of prohibited occupations for children under 16 years of age, among these the assorting, manufacturing, and packing of tobacco.

During the short time in which the officer of the Child-Labor Division was in Kentucky, 17 factories were inspected in company with the State inspector in eight cities and towns in different parts of the State. These 17 factories included 5 textile mills, manufacturing cotton yarn and cloth, hosiery, cordage, and a dyeing and finishing establishment; and 5 tobacco factories and stemmeries. Of the 7 remaining, 1 was manufacturing ax handles, another watch cases, and the others were an awning and tent factory, a cloth-glove factory, a box factory, a furniture factory, and a cannery.

The inspections show that the tobacco factories were the most frequent violators of the Kentucky law. Only 1 of the 5 inspected was not guilty of a violation. Of the 14 children under 16 years who were working more than 8 hours a day, 13 were employed in tobacco factories; and the 11 children under 14 years of age found employed were either making twist tobacco or working in stemmeries. Their ages ranged from 8 to 13 years. In addition to these, 13 children between 14 and 16, who were making twist and stemming, were illegally employed, as the State law prohibited children under 16 from such work.

The employment certificates in Kentucky were issued by the school superintendents, or by a person authorized by him in writing, or by the county superintendent where there was no local superintendent of schools. Issuing officers were required to report to the factory inspection department all certificates issued and refused. These returns were checked by the State factory inspector, and if they had been issued illegally, both the firm and the issuing officer were notified and the cancellation of the certificate ordered. The State inspector had endeavored to familiarize parents, employers, and school officials with the provisions of the law enacted in 1918, but the work of issuance was being very unevenly done in the cities and towns visited. Most of the superintendents favored the law but were inexperienced in its administration. A few were knowingly violating the law. For example, one superintendent issued what he expected would be accepted as certificates for four children under 14. These were signed statements that the child named thereon was permitted

to work for a specified firm while schools were not in session. When the firm was prosecuted the manager admitted he knew the children were illegally employed but thought it would be all right since the employment was sanctioned by the superintendent of schools.

Maryland.

Prior to June 3, 1918, while the Federal child-labor act was operative, only eight establishments were inspected in Maryland—three canneries on the Eastern Shore, one cotton mill, and four glass factories. In the canneries 16 children under 14 years of age were working, and 28 under 16 years of age were employed more than eight hours a day. In the cotton mill one child was employed over eight hours a day and four were working at night.

At the time the Federal child-labor law went into effect, and when the inspections referred to above were made, children of 12 were permitted to work in the canneries of Maryland, and children between 14 and 16 years of age who were unable to meet the educational standards required for a general certificate could work during the vacation season on a vacation permit. The hours of work for children under 16 employed in canneries were not restricted under the State law. The Federal child-labor law specifically included canneries, so that from September 1, 1917, to June 3, 1918, a cannery that employed children under 14 years of age, or children between 14 and 16 more than eight hours a day, or before 6 a. m. or after 7 p. m., could not ship its products in interstate commerce except under penalty. The few inspections made in the autumn of 1917, just as the canning season was closing, indicated the employment of great numbers of very young children in the canneries of the State, so a special investigation was planned for the season of 1918. Although an amendment to the State child-labor law made during the legislative session of 1918 prohibited the employment of children under 14 in canneries, it did not bring the children so employed under the protection of the eight-hour law, so that under the State law children between 14 and 16 years of age could still be employed any number of hours in the canneries. It was therefore decided to make the inspections planned, in order to learn the extent of employment of young children in the canneries of Maryland and the hours they were working.

Many kinds of fruits and vegetables are packed by the canneries of Maryland, but tomato canneries are the most important, both in size and number, and in the per cent of children employed. The peak of the tomato season usually comes between August 15 and October 1. It was during this period, after the fruit canning season was over and when the canning of tomatoes, corn, and beans was at its height, that the Child-Labor Division inspected 205 canneries located in the principal canning districts of the State—the nine coun-

ties on the Eastern Shore of Maryland, and Harford, Anne Arundel, and Baltimore Counties, and Baltimore City on the western shore. The most important canning centers are in Caroline, Dorchester, Talbot, and Wicomico Counties on the Eastern Shore, and Harford County and Baltimore City on the western shore.

The inspection of the canneries presented many difficulties. While the largest ones were usually located where railroads were convenient, many of them were almost inaccessible to an inspector trying to go from one to another by rail. Shipments of the canned products were usually to Baltimore and Philadelphia; and even small canneries scattered on the "points," "necks," and "islands," that were almost inaccessible to one approaching from the inland, had excellent shipping facilities from their own docks on the river. A few canneries were located in out-of-the-way places, where the inconvenience of transportation was compensated for by the nearness to the tomato fields or a local (often colored) labor supply.

Children were hurried out of some canneries on the approach of the inspectors, while in others the children were allowed to continue working as a matter of course. Strangers did not often come to these canning centers, so the children could, if they had been instructed, run away and remain in hiding until assured that the visitor was not an inspector. Some of the mothers reported that the row bosses threatened to send them to jail if the child-labor inspectors caught their children at work, so that usually the children scattered in all directions on the approach of an inspector.

This made it extremely difficult for the inspector to interview anything like the complete number of children working. Altogether 741 children under 14 were found at work in 172 of the 205 canneries visited by the inspectors. Their ages were as follows:

5 years of age, or under	10
6 years of age	7
7 years of age	12
8 years of age	13
9 years of age	33
10 years of age	54
11 years of age	101
12 years of age	199
13 years of age	312
Total	741

Altogether, 1,728 children under 16 were found at work in the canneries, so that for these factories the number of children under 14 (741) constituted 42.9 per cent of the total number of children employed. Baltimore was reached late in the season, after many of the canneries had closed. Of 27 in Baltimore City and Baltimore County, only 13 were in operation when visited, and 6 of these were arranging to close in a few days. The influenza epidemic made impos-

sible the investigation of the ages of many of the Baltimore children found at work and believed to be under age. In the 13 factories, 62 children under 16 years of age were found at work, and 26 of this number were under 14 years of age. Managers of 9 canneries said they had been employing children under 14 during the season. In 4 canneries the children ran from the inspectors. In general, the children were working the same number of hours as the adults, but no time records were kept except in 1 factory.

Many of the canners outside of Baltimore made no pretense of obeying the State law. When the "row bosses" engaged help they had assured the parents that children of any age would be allowed to work uninterruptedly. Some of the row bosses claimed they had had such instructions from the canners. In one instance a letter was produced by a row boss, signed by a canner operating a string of canneries, authorizing him to employ children "of any age." These children were sometimes employed as pieceworkers and sometimes as time workers.

The pieceworkers included those engaged in the preparation of fruits and vegetables—for example, peeling tomatoes, husking corn, capping berries, etc. They were paid by the pail or whatever unit of measure was employed—checks were given to them or cards were punched for each pail or measure filled. Sometimes the smaller children, who had to stand on boxes in order to reach the peeling table, worked with their mothers or other relatives, and their earnings were added to those of the older members of the family. Others worked independently, and often proudly exhibited the number of checks earned.

While the adults worked steadily, the children were allowed considerable freedom in coming and going, especially those who were imported with their parents and lived in the labor camps. This was even more noticeable in the corn-husking sheds, where smaller children were more often found than in tomato canneries. Those too small to husk corn sometimes assisted their mothers by "silking the corn," removing husks, and pushing the corn within their mothers' reach.

The boys and girls who were time workers usually labeled cans and rolled them down the chute and inspected cans passing on conveyors. Boys were sometimes employed on a time rate to do trucking, hauling, removing skins, and general laboring work, such as carrying baskets of tomatoes to steamers or to the peelers, and piling baskets, cans, and cases.

The canners rarely kept accurate time records. The names of the time workers and day laborers were frequently entered in a book, and a mark opposite the name indicated that the individual designated worked a day and was entitled to a day's pay. If these records had

been accurately kept and in detail it would not have been a difficult matter to compute the actual working hours of the children who were time workers. But their working day depended upon the supply of tomatoes or cans and how the machinery was running.

No time records whatever were kept for the pieceworkers. They were paid according to the number of checks or punches they had. Sometimes children as young as 7 or 8 years were regarded as good workers by their parents, and worked with the steadiness and speed of adult workers. They reported that they worked all day, beginning when the cannery whistle blew in the morning and stopping when the run of tomatoes was over, which might be early or late. Neither the children nor the parents were able to tell the exact hours they worked. When the mothers worked in the evenings the children usually worked with them; in interviewing them a difference of opinion frequently developed between the mothers and children as to which night or nights in the week they had worked after supper, and the total number of hours they had worked on any recent day.

The average length of day in the canneries when tomatoes were plentiful was about 10 hours. When the season was at its height the workers not infrequently began at 6 o'clock in the morning and worked until 9 or 10 o'clock at night, with half an hour off for dinner and the same length of time for supper.

Because of the irregularity of the hours the canneries operated and the lack of time records, it was impossible to get definite information showing the hours the minors worked; but the inspectors reported that all the 1,380 children under 16 interviewed by them reported that they had worked more than 8 hours a day some of the time. As the hours for minors in canneries were not regulated by the State law and the Federal law was inoperative, this was not illegal.

Maryland was designated under the Federal child-labor act as a State whose legislative standards with reference to certificates or work permits met those required by the rules and regulations.[8] The cannery inspections showed that in the towns where the canneries were located there was no uniformity in the issuance, and that the State law was almost more honored in the breach than in the observance. How generally the law was disregarded was shown by

[8] Under the Maryland child-labor law, employers were required to keep on file certificates for all children between 14 and 16 years of age. The following evidence of age was required in the order named: (*a*) Birth record; (*b*) passport or baptismal certificate; (*c*) other documentary evidence; (*d*) physician's certificate of age, supported by a parent's affidavit. The educational requirements for Baltimore City was completion of the fifth grade, and for the rest of the State under the compulsory school law completion of the seventh grade. A physician's certificate showing physical fitness to perform the work was also required. There were two kinds of certificates issued—(*a*) general, permitting a child to work during the entire year, and (*b*) vacation, permitting a child to work during such time as he is not required to attend school. Every child must be able to read and write English, but completion of the fifth or seventh grade was not required for vacation permits. Except for this, the requirements were the same for both general and vacation permits.

the fact that 543 children between 14 and 16 years of age who could legally qualify for certificates were employed without them, although in each case this was a violation of the Maryland law.

Outside Baltimore, certificates were issued to the children by physicians appointed by the county superintendents of schools, with the approval of the State board of labor and statistics. Children residing in Baltimore City were required to get their certificates at the office of the State board of labor and statistics before leaving Baltimore to go to the canneries to work. Prior to the opening of the canning season, the State board of labor and statistics instructed the canners, through circular letters, to notify their row bosses to this effect. This course had been decided upon primarily because better facilities were afforded at the Baltimore office for securing evidence of age and consulting such previous records of employment as existed, and for making physical examinations of the applicants.

The organization for the issuance of certificates in the several counties in which the canneries were inspected varied greatly. In some, considerable attention had apparently been given to this work by appointing a physician in every industrial community. In other counties, no attention whatever had been given the matter, and canners not inclined to observe the law had as an excuse the fact that they were unable to secure certificates for the children of working age whom they desired to employ.

The certificating system was probably not so well organized as in other years because some of the physicians had resigned to go into the Army or the Red Cross. In many communities the vacancies caused by resignations had not been filled. Other physicians said that it did not pay them to bother with the issuance of certificates because they received only 50 cents for each child examined.

One canner complained of the difficulty experienced in getting the doctors who had been authorized to issue certificates to examine the children. He said he went to him several times and paid about $5 for the issuance of certificates, although the fee which the State paid was supposed to be the only charge made.

The doctors who were issuing certificates were often not in sympathy with the law. Except in a few cases, no attempt was made to live up to the regulations. Usually they went to the canneries to issue the certificates. No arrangements were made to have the parent or guardian appear or to have the documentary evidence of age required by the law presented. The fact that a cannery desired to employ a child was often regarded as sufficient reason for issuing a permit. Children were required, under the law, to be able to read and write English. Several certificates were found which the child had signed with a cross because he was unable to write his name.

One physician issued for two large canneries in a community. In one of these, 12 certificates were filed, stating the children were 14 years of age or over. Eleven of these children were, in fact, only 11, 12, or 13 years of age. One boy told his mother that he gave the correct date of his birth—1905; but when his certificate was issued the doctor had recorded it as 1904. In the other cannery, 14 certificates were filed, 7 of which were illegally issued. One of the children involved was only 11 years old, although the certificate stated that he was 14.

In a cannery in another community, 14 certificates were filed, of which 6 were illegally issued. Two of the children were under age, and 4 general certificates had been issued to children who had not completed the seventh grade. In another cannery 18 certificates were filed, 7 of which were issued to children under 14 years of age. One of the children when interviewed said he was 13 years old. The certificate showed him to be 14. When asked for an explanation he said he told the doctor he was born in October, 1904, and the doctor recorded 1903 on his certificate. In every case "birth certificate" was checked as the evidence of age accepted for these certificates, although but few were recorded with the State health department. After the inspectors entered one cannery in this community a little girl was seen to run across the street, and in less than five minutes she returned with an employment certificate which the doctor had just issued. She said she had been unaccompanied by her parent, had not produced any evidence of age, and no physical examination had been made. In another community the authorized physician issued a number of certificates to children under legal working age, among them his own 13-year-old son. This certificate for his son stated that he was 14 years old, and birth certificate was designated as the documentary evidence which established his age. His birth was registered with the Baltimore City health department, and showed he was only 13 years old at the time the work certificate was issued. A number of "certificates" written on physician's prescription blanks by physicians who had not been authorized to issue certificates were found on file. One was as follows:

> Permit ———, 14, to work in a canning house, according to her age and capability.
> Yours, truly,
> ——— ———, M. D.
> August 13, 1918.

Another cannery had the following "certificate" filed:

> ———, 14 years, desires work in the cannery, and is physically able to do so.
> ——— ———, M. D.

A number of such statements were found on file, and in one instance the canner admitted he knew they were worthless.

Birth registration in Maryland has been very incomplete, particularly of the colored children. Many churches in the rural districts where the children were baptized had no records. Bible records and insurance policies, however, were usually available, and a school census recently taken in the counties was on file in the offices of the county superintendents of schools and served as an excellent check in investigating the ages of children found at work.

Forms for the issuance of certificates and for filing records of certificates issued and refused, as well as files with alphabetical guides, were furnished the issuing officers by the State board of labor and statistics. These records were rarely so kept as to enable the inspector to check up the children's ages after inspections.

The violations of the Maryland child-labor law, which resulted in the employment of large numbers of very young children, were especially to be deplored because the cannery camp and the canneries were undesirable places for the children to live and work. Some canneries employed local help, sometimes white and sometimes colored, and the children lived at home; but many of the larger canning factories outside of Baltimore imported their labor from other counties and near-by cities, provided camps for them to live in during the season, and paid their transportation both ways. Italians from Philadelphia, Poles and Bohemians from Baltimore, and Negroes, usually from the southern part of the Eastern Shore, formed the bulk of this class of labor.

While there were a great many children about all the camps visited, these imported workers were not always family groups, especially among the white workers. Many single men and women, and some boys and girls unaccompanied by their parents, "signed up" with the row bosses.

Where both white and colored help were employed, separate quarters were provided. The camps varied greatly in convenience and sanitation, but they were usually much alike in construction. The commonest type was two or more rows of one-room shacks about 10 feet square and 7 or 8 feet high, which were used as sleeping quarters for a family. The roofs and walls were not water-tight and the floors were often in bad repair. Usually there was only one window in the shack, sometimes of glass; occasionally only a wooden shutter furnished insufficient light and ventilation. Neither windows nor doors were screened, and the shacks were infested with flies by day and mosquitoes by night. Occasionally one found the entire floor of a building partitioned off into compartments with boards about 10 inches high, and each compartment was occupied by a family.

For example, at one camp one large room had been divided by board partitions 8 inches high into compartments for six families. Only one of these had been curtained off so that the members of the family could have any privacy.

A bed or a cot was rarely found. Usually a space was boarded off and filled with straw; the family provided its own bedding, and they all slept together in the same bunk.

Rude fireplaces built outdoors as a rule afforded the only means of cooking the food. These were often unprotected from the weather, making cooking a most difficult task at times. Occasionally a family furnished its own stove and built a rude shelter of boards and brush over it. Tables were made by nailing boards on four stakes driven into the ground, and benches made in the same way were placed at each side of the table.

The camp privies, usually unscreened and insufficient in number, were not always provided separately for the sexes, and in several places there were none at all. Drinking water was usually obtained from a spring or well near by, but often the workers were obliged to carry water from a distance. With but one exception, no bathing facilities were provided. Sometimes the general camp drainage was poor. In several places refuse from the cannery drained toward the camps, and the odor of decaying tomatoes was almost unbearable. Sometimes, however, the camps were built some distance from the canneries and the surroundings were much pleasanter.

Such camps as have been described were neither morally nor physically safe places for the children to live. Sometimes the employers complained that they had to employ the children in order to keep their mothers at work; and it was doubtless true that the row boss induced many of them to come by a promise of large family earnings, and that except for this fact the parents would have remained where living conditions were more decent.

And the work itself, particularly in the tomato canneries, was often ugly and dangerous for little children. Sometimes the children were barefooted; sometimes they wore shoes and stood for hours in the wet refuse which drained from the peeling tables. In some canneries, in which proper provisions for drainage had not been made, the floors were covered to the depth of several inches with refuse, and the workers attempted to keep dry by standing on boxes. Many of them wore waterproof aprons. Often women and children were found with bags, newspapers, and various substitutes for aprons tied around them, but these crude devices did not protect their clothing from becoming saturated with tomato juice and water. In only a few canneries were seats provided, so that the peelers usually had to stand constantly while they worked. Those who peeled tomatoes steadily, adults or children, were observed to have acquired a swaying motion of the body, and the rhythm apparently enabled them to work long hours and still keep up their speed.

In the other occupations, such as capping, inspecting cans on conveyors, and various jobs around the processing room, there was danger of injury from machinery or from vats of boiling water.

Working conditions in the corn canneries were generally more favorable than those in tomato canneries, but there were always physical hazards in the employment of young children for the long hours they so frequently worked during the season.

The educational loss was serious. Some families followed cannery work throughout the year, working in the Maryland fruit and vegetable canneries in summer and going south to the oyster and shrimp canneries in winter. Because of this nomadic life some of the children interviewed had never attended school, and others were barely able to read and write. The cannery children usually leave school in May or early June for the berry pack and often do not return until late in October. If the parents stay on to work in the sweet-potato canneries of Maryland, they do not return to school until November, as they are not compelled to attend the neighborhood schools—indeed, they are usually not desired, as the school arrangements are not made to include this temporary population.

A number of colored children of school age were found in one camp adjoining a cannery operating late in October. When inquiry was made as to why the children were not attending school, the inspector was told that as these children were not legal residents of the county, they were not entitled to the benefit of the money expended on the schools.

But in localities where the help was local, children of school age were often not required to be in school. The State board of education granted permission to the principals of high schools to excuse boys enrolled in these schools until October 14, 1918, provided they were actively engaged in agricultural work or some form of industrial war work. The recommendation was made that credits for such work be given at the close of the year, provided that a high grade of work had been done throughout the year. In the letter sent out by the State board of education, it was specifically stated that this recommendation did not apply to elementary schools. In some of the cannery towns the county superintendents of schools seemed to have ignored this part of the recommendation entirely and were making no attempt to compel children from the elementary schools who were working in canneries or on the farms to attend school. The colored schools in these counties had made a practice of opening late in the fall, in order that the colored children might work through the cannery and harvest season.

While there was general complaint from the canners about the shortage of labor due to war conditions, it seemed quite unfounded, except for such work as processing and the heavier jobs about the cannery, for which men were essential. The bulk of the work in the Maryland canneries had always been done by women and children. The supply of women for cannery work was reported about normal,

but the wages they demanded were higher. At the beginning of the season of 1918, when contracts were being made for workers to go to the camps, the women asked wages equivalent to those paid in other industries—and in some cases in excess of what they were earning in Baltimore—before they would agree to go to the country. Some of the canners said that the labor shortage was not so serious a problem as the shortage of cans.

During the summer of 1918, the food-saving campaign conducted by the Food Administration had been turned by the canners into a patriotic reason for violating the child-labor law. Many said that the children were aiding effectively in winning the war by helping to save the tomato and corn crops. Expressions of surprise at the inconsistency of the Government in questioning who did the work of the canneries during the war were frequent. No official national approval had been given to this viewpoint; and during the period of the war the State Legislature of Maryland had for the first time prohibited the employment of children under 14 years of age in canneries. While the Food Administration did not take into account the labor element in its food-production campaign, and had not sought to introduce any labor clauses in the food licenses, the War Labor Policies Board, in which the Food Administration was represented, had voted against the employment of children under 14 years of age, and of children between 14 and 16 years of age more than eight hours a day, or on night work. The canners could give no reason for saying that the employment of these young children in Maryland was "necessary to win the war." At the annual meeting of the National Consumers' League, held in Baltimore after the United States had entered the war,[9] the Secretary of War had given a warning against yielding to such demands.

"I have not the least doubt," he said, "as a matter of fact, I have some very definite knowledge, that employers who have contracts with the Government or with the Allies, or who make things more or less necessary to the life of the people, are constantly saying to themselves and to State enforcing agencies, and to me as Secretary of War and as a member of the Council of National Defense: 'This is not the time * * * to enforce these laws about children and women and their hours and condition of labor; too large and momentous events are moving now for anybody to stop with these things.' That demand is being made everywhere. Now, the duty of the Consumers' League and of every member of it, and of everybody who knows its philosophy and believes in it, is to set his face resolutely against everything that on any pretext seeks to break down those barriers which we have set up, through years of patient labor, against the enervation and dissipation of the child life and of the

[9] Industrial Liberty in Wartime. Address of the Hon. Newton D. Baker, Secretary of War, at the eighteenth annual meeting of the National Consumers' League, Baltimore, Nov. 14, 1917

woman life and of the man life of this country. * * * You have an opportunity to be explicit in teaching and impressing the lesson that we can not afford, when we are losing boys in France, to lose children in the United States at the same time."

Massachusetts.

When the inspections in Rhode Island, which had been undertaken before the United States child-labor law had been declared unconstitutional, were completed, the officers of the division had been last inspecting in the Blackstone Valley, and their work was extended along that river into Massachusetts and later into other parts of the State. The minimum age and hour standards in Massachusetts were the same as those of the Federal act, except for a difference of an hour and a half in the time when children were prohibited from working.[10] There were also special provisions for seats, lunch hour, and for the protection of the health of women and young people. In addition, the State law contained a list of prohibited occupations for children under 16, and it required completion of the fourth grade in school for a general certificate (but not for a vacation permit), and an examination to prove physical fitness for the work contemplated before a 14-year-old child could secure a work permit. In Boston, where children between 14 and 16 years of age were required to attend continuation school, the enrollment in this school was a part of the regular certificating routine. The proof of age required under the Massachusetts law was substantially the same as that laid down in regulation 2 of the Federal rules and regulations, except that a school record of age was preferred to a physician's certificate of physical age.

Employment certificates were issued by the superintendent of schools or by a person authorized by him in writing; where there was no superintendent, by a person authorized by the school committee. But in Massachusetts, as in other States in which the carrying out of the law has been intrusted to local officers, the inspections showed quite different administrative practices in spite of the legislative standards laid down for the whole State. In the larger cities and industrial towns the issuing of certificates was carefully and accurately done, so that the largest number of children who were going to work were protected. But the smaller industrial towns of Massachusetts are by no means unimportant.

In most of the towns visited the superintendent himself, or an attendance officer, or a clerk in the office of the superintendent or attendance officer, was issuing the certificates. In one town a school physician, and in two towns janitors, were authorized by the superintendent to issue certificates. In two others this work was being

[10] Massachusetts prohibition was from 6 p. m. to 6.30 a. m. The Federal one was from 7 p. m. to 6 a. m.

done by members of the school committee. As might be expected, the janitors were doing the work in a quite unsatisfactory manner, using the wrong forms, and not requiring birth records or other documentary proof of age. One superintendent employed a clerk for $5 a week to issue certificates during his absence from the city. The clerk made a $5 a week job of it. But the janitor and the underpaid clerk were not the only ones who did the work carelessly. One superintendent saw no harm in allowing a boy to work while his age was being investigated; he therefore encouraged the practice, although it was contrary to the State law. Another disregarded the evidence of age required by law and issued on the school record in almost every case. He had little respect for documentary evidence and said he could tell the ages of children by their hands. While not claiming this power, other superintendents were not securing the best proof of age. Inspectors found many certificates issued on school records or physician's certificates when contemporary family records and framed baptismal certificates were found in the homes of the children. Some certificates were made out in pencil and given to the child to present to the employer. Such records could easily be changed and some instances were reported where this had been done.

As no minimum standards or suggestions for judging physical age had been adopted by the State, the superintendents, with good reason, placed little faith in the physician's certificate of age. One physician said he always certified to the age the child gave. Even in the largest cities the examination for physical fitness was hurried, and very few children were refused certificates on this test. One school physician who found defects in a very large percentage of the children he examined was much concerned over the failure to require the correction of defects before certificates were issued. While certificates were given for specific occupations, the issuing officers had little if any information with reference to prohibited occupations; and whether the children were or were not illegally employed was usually regarded as the business of the employer and the factory inspectors only. Sometimes, however, rulings were made by the local superintendents. Thus, one superintendent was refusing to issue permits for boys under 16 to work as heaters and passers in the shipyards, holding that it was work on a scaffolding and therefore prohibited by law, although the commissioner of labor had ruled the other way.

In the course of the inspections in Massachusetts, 98 factories in 30 cities and towns were inspected. Most of these inspections were made in textile mills, including woolen, cotton, linen, hosiery, bleaching and dyeing, and finishing; but some were made in establishments manufacturing shoes, corsets, wooden-box shooks, knives, envelopes,

optical goods, and other articles. Altogether, 2,375 children under 16 years of age were found at work, and there were no certificates on file for 221. Of those on file, 192 were not in accordance with the requirements of the State law, the most common irregularity being the failure to indicate the kind of evidence on which the certificate was issued. Violations of the Massachusetts law other than failure to have certificates for all children between 14 and 16 years of age were found in the course of the inspections.

TABLE VIII.—*Number of mills and factories inspected in Massachusetts between June 3, and September 5, 1918; and number of children employed in violation of Federal and State age and hour standards in these mills and factories, by industry.*

Industry.	Mills and factories inspected.	Children employed in violation of Federal and State age and hour standards.			
		Age.		Hour.	
		Federal.	State.	Federal.	State.
Total	98	16	16	172	168
Woolen and worsted goods	40	2	2	77	76
Cotton goods	29	3	3	48	47
Optical goods	4	.....	.....	15	15
Felt goods	4	.....	.....	16	16
Bleaching, dyeing, and finishing textiles	4	.....	.....	1	1
Linen goods	3	4	1	10	10
Celluloid goods	3	.....	.....	.....	.....
Boots and shoes	2	5	5	5	5
Corsets	2	.....	.....	.....	.....
Knit goods	1	1	1	.....	.....
All other industries [1]	6	1	1	.....	.....

[1] All other industries embrace: Wooden-box shooks, 1 establishment; suspenders, garters, and elastic woven goods, 1 establishment; cutlery, 1 establishment; envelopes, 1 establishment; not finished leather goods, 1 establishment; miscellaneous, 1 establishment.

As Table VIII shows, there were 16 children under 14 years of age employed. Four of these were 12, and twelve, 13 years of age. There were also 172 children under 16 years of age who were employed more than eight hours a day, if the hours are computed in accordance with regulation 6 of the Federal rules and regulations; i. e., from the time the child begins employment until he leaves off work for the day, exclusive of a single continuous period off. Using the Massachusetts method of allowing more than one period to be counted as time off, 168 children under 16 years of age were working more than the legal eight-hour day.

In one mill a 12-year-old boy was helping his mother piece up ends. The mother claimed that she brought the boy to the mill to keep him out of bad company, and the boy stated that he had the issuing officer's approval. This the issuing officer denied, and the superintendent of the mill said that the younger brothers and sisters of the employees came into the mill and that he had been unable to prevent this practice under present conditions. He assured the officer of the Child-Labor Division that these children did not work; but he

said the same regarding the boy found at work with his mother. Massachusetts employers are accustomed to inspections and generally realize the futility in the long run of hiding children, as well as the effect such a policy has on the courts. Still, in one mill the inspector was kept waiting about 10 minutes before being permitted to begin the inspection. She was later told by a boy under the legal working age, whom she interviewed in the factory, that 12 children had been sent out by the "bosses" that morning to get their certificates. Another inspection was made several days later. This time the inspector went to the factory without applying at the office, and two of the underage children were apprehended.

In one textile mill 27 children under 16 years of age were found working 8½ hours a day.[11] The superintendent of the mill gave as an excuse the shortage of labor and said he had been required to work them for longer hours for two weeks prior to the inspector's visit.[12] The period of their employment for longer hours was verified by the time-book records.

In another mill the posted hours showed an eight-hour day for minors. The time books showed that the boys were employed for a longer period. When asked for an explanation, the foreman said the hours had been increased after the vacation began; that the orders came through the office. The manager had previously explained at some length to the inspector the unfair competition from which Massachusetts manufacturers suffered because of their high labor standards.

The occupations in which children under 16 were found employed varied greatly. In textile mills they were employed at the usual occupations of spinning, doffing, weaving, spooling, twisting, reeling, winding, sweeping, cleaning, oiling, roping, weighing yarn; carrying yarn, bobbins, and filling; specking, burling, examining, doubling, steaming bobbins, and errand service; tending or running folder, speeder, gill box, calender, and drier.

In the manufacturing of optical goods children were found japanning, nickel plating, sorting, pasting, soldering, bending guards, labeling, wiping lenses, gauging, edging, polishing, cutting glass, counting stock, inserting and removing screws, washing gold, mounting eyes, covering cases, etc.

---

[11] The inspector obtained proof of age for 24 of these; certificates on file for the remaining 3 showed they were under 16.

[12] After the declaration of war by the United States, Massachusetts provided for a War Emergency Industrial Commission with authority, on application of an employer and after a hearing by the commission, to grant a permit to an employer authorizing him to suspend the operation of any of the laws regulating the employment of labor provided it was shown at the hearing that the work to complete which the employer asked the suspension was "required by an emergency arising out of the existing state of war." No such permits had been granted this employer, nor were they granted by the commission to any employer seeking suspension or modification of the State child-labor laws during the war.

In the manufacture of celluloid goods children were packing and nesting, running drier, pointing pins, stacking, dipping, drilling, and polishing buttons, beveling, reaming, and doing odd jobs.

In the manufacture of leather shoes and goods children were stitching, finishing shoes, cementing soles, punching holes, trimming, sticking nails, heeling, sorting, sizing, matching, pulling tacks, hobnailing, brushing shoes, finishing bottoms, grooving welts, blacking soles, shellacking, slugging heels, and engaged in errand and clerical service. In one factory a boy under 16 was employed at a machine stamping leather.

In the manufacture of corsets children were tending power machines, boning, steel setting, stitching, boxing, examining, cutting, marking, tacking lace, lacing, running errands, and doing odd jobs.

Twenty-six factories and 3 shipyards were inspected in Massachusetts in the first four months of 1919, in connection with the enforcement of the child-labor contract clause.[13] Of the factories[14] inspected, which were located in 21 towns, 8 were engaged in the manufacture of woolen goods; 4 made narrow fabrics and elastic webbings; 5 made rubber goods; 1 was a cotton mill; 1 a bleachery; 3 made felt goods; 2 manufactured shoes; 1 was a men's clothing establishment; and in 1, shock absorbers were made.

One child under 14 years of age was found employed in a webbing factory and 1 in a shipyard. Six violations of the Federal and State hour standards were found in 3 factories. As in the earlier Massachusetts inspections the most common violations were in connection with provisions of the State law relating to certificates. Twenty-eight of the 603 children under 16 years of age interviewed in the factories and 11 of the 62 children under 16 years of age at work in the shipyards had no certificates. They had given their ages as 16 when applying for employment and were put to work without further inquiries.

New York.

Before the United States child-labor act was declared unconstitutional arrangements had been made with the New York Industrial Commission for cooperation in the inspection of the New York cannery districts, where convictions of employers violating the State labor laws were difficult to secure before local magistrates. This plan gave no relief to the New York situation after the act was declared unconstitutional and it was therefore abandoned, but some inspections were made in November and December of 1918.

The standards of the New York child-labor law were higher than those of the Federal act. The minimum age of employment in factories was 14; but before a work permit was given a child he had to prove 130 days' school attendance during the 12 months prior to his

[13] See p. 140.

[14] In only 3 of these had previous inspections been made.

fourteenth birthday or to the date of application for a permit, and completion of the eighth grade or its equivalent if over 14 and under 15 years of age, or of the sixth grade if over 15 and under 16 years of age.[15]

The hour standards of the New York law were also higher than those of the Federal, for in addition to prohibiting the employment in factories of children under 16 years of age more than eight hours a day, or six days a week, it provided that they could not be employed before 8 a. m. or after 5 p. m.—a very much better provision for the child than that found in the Federal law, and administratively helpful in the enforcement of the eight-hour limitation.

The certificates or work permits were issued by the local boards of health subject to supervision by the industrial commission. This supervision had consisted in the past mainly of the requirement of semimonthly reports giving the names of all children to whom certificates had been issued, duplicate records of the physical examination of children either passed or refused, and the kinds of evidence of age accepted; the approval of forms for cities of the first and second class; and the furnishing of blank forms in all other cities and towns. Boards of health were required to make weekly reports to the local superintendents of schools of the names and addresses of children granted or refused certificates, and the reasons for the refusals; and the State commissioner of education had authority to supervise the work of the local superintendents in the issuance of the educational certificates. The law thus looked to general cooperation between the health, education, and labor departments in its enforcement.

The evidence accepted as proof of age under the New York statute was substantially the same as under the Federal regulations—a birth certificate, a passport, a certificate of baptism, other satisfactory documentary evidence, and if documentary proof of age could not be obtained, a physician's certificate of age. Two physicians of the public-health department were required to certify to the children's age; and if they disagreed, a third physician must decide.[16] In order that this method of establishing the age of children should be resorted to only when more reliable evidence could not be procured, the law provided that the parent must file a written application for physicians' certificate, and this application must be held for examination for a period of 60 days. As there was no provision in the New York law for revoking certificates upon the discovery of better evidence of age, and no way of surely locating the child if such evidence was discovered, inasmuch as the New York law did not require a new certificate with each change of employment, this requirement that a

[15] The law adopted in 1918, permitting children who had not completed the sixth or eighth grade in school to work on vacation permits, applied only to mercantile establishments and business offices, and not to factory employment.

[16] The provision as to physicians' certificate applies to cities of the first class only.

period of 60 days should pass is very important. Medical examinations to determine physical fitness and the correction of physical defects discovered were also required under the New York law before certificates could be procured.

Seven cities and towns, including Albany, Buffalo, Kendall, New York City, Rochester, Syracuse, and Troy, were visited by inspectors of the Child-Labor Division in company with the State inspector, and 138 factories were inspected. As a rule, the State inspectors continued their regular route in the block system of inspection which had been adopted in New York State. This meant that there was no selection of the important child-employing industries, and that many very small shops were covered. In 95 of the 138 establishments visited no children under 16 years of age were employed; and in only 17 was the total number of employees 100 or more.

The establishments inspected included a variety of industries. The largest number in any one industry was 51 clothing factories; there were also 7 textile mills manufacturing silk, cotton, and knit goods; 6 factories making pearl buttons; 3 bakeries; 3 cigar, 3 infants' shoes, and 3 candle factories; 12 printing, publishing, bookbinding, and engraving establishments; 6 engaged in the manufacture of machine shop and foundry products (including the manufacture of aeroplane and automobile parts); 3 were making electrical apparatus and supplies; and the remainder were miscellaneous establishments, including a brewery, laundry, bottling works, cider mill, and establishments engaged in evaporating fruits, dyeing and manufacturing fur goods, manufacturing badges and buttons, perfume and toilet articles, upholstering, cleaning hats, pulverizing cheese, etc. Six wholesale mercantile establishments were among the 138 inspections made.

In the course of the inspections in New York 3 children under 14 years of age were found at work and 31 between 14 and 16 years of age were found working more than eight hours a day, as Table I [17] shows.

There were on file certificates for 115 children between 14 and 16 years of age. One child under 16 was cutting candles at a circular saw, and one under 18 was working at an emery wheel, both in violation of the State law. Seven of the children employed more than eight hours a day were working in textile mills, 3 in the manufacture of candles, 2 of electrical apparatus, 1 of pearl buttons and of toilet articles, and another in a printing establishment. The industries in which the largest numbers were employed without certificates were the textile mills, clothing, paper, and candle factories.

The occupations in which the children under 16 were employed varied. In the manufacture of ready-made clothing they worked

[17] Appendix I, p. 172.

as operators of sewing or button machines, markers, examiners, inspectors, counters, basting pullers, folders, notchers, helpers in cutting room, and errand service. In the manufacture of candles children were employed pulling, knotting, and cutting wicks; molding; cutting candles; packing and stenciling boxes; and errand service.

In textile mills children were spinning, weaving, winding, doffing, reeling, helping in weave room and shipping room, and working as stock clerk and spare hand. Some were employed in miscellaneous jobs such as drilling holes in pearl buttons, bottling soft drinks and oils and labeling bottles, rolling cigars, shaking and catching clothes in a laundry, and soldering, assembling parts, packing, and general utility work in the manufacture of electrical apparatus.

North Carolina.

In the western district of North Carolina, one of the most important textile districts in the United States, an injunction was granted by the United States district court on August 31, 1917, restraining the United States attorney from enforcing the Federal child-labor law. In order to meet the requests of their customers, a number of the mills desired to give the guaranty prescribed in the act; and for this reason the issuing of the Federal certificates of age was continued in the district until the decision of the Supreme Court was rendered on June 3, 1918, but only one inspection was made in the western district prior to that date.

The child-labor standards established by the laws of North Carolina prohibited the employment of children under 13 years of age in any factory or manufacturing establishment. It permitted the employment of children between 12 and 13 years of age as apprentices only if the employer kept on file statements of their ages signed by their parents, and certificates showing they had attended school 4 months of the preceding 12.[18] No children under 16 could be legally employed in North Carolina between 9 p. m. and 6 a. m. There was no regulation of the hours of work beyond the general limitations which restricted the hours of all employees to the 60-hour week and the 11-hour day.

---

[18] A law enacted in 1919 prohibits the employment of children under 14 years of age "*except in cases and under regulations prescribed by the State child-welfare commission.*" This commission, by a ruling of August 6, 1919, provided that girls should not be employed under 14 years of age, but that boys 12 and over could be employed outside school hours and during vacation on permit from county superintendent of public welfare. The act does not limit the hours of work for children between 14 and 16 years of age. The measure passed had the support of manufacturers. At the annual meeting of the Cotton Manufacturers' Association of North Carolina, which was held at Asheville, July 5–6, 1918, among other resolutions adopted was one beginning: "Whereas the North Carolina Cotton Manufacturers' Association is on record as advocating the passage of a 12-year compulsory school law, which is now in effect, and has previously recommended that the age limit for compulsory education should be raised to 14 years" (the compulsory limit had been raised to 14 in 1917; Acts of 1917, ch. 208); and continued with a resolution * * * "that it is the sense of the association that the school term may be made six months instead of 4;" * * * "that no boy or girl under 14 years of age shall be employed or worked in any factory or manufacturing establishment in this State; and that no boy or girl under 16 shall be employed or worked in any mill, factory, or manufacturing establishment in this State, between the hours of 9.30 p. m. and 6 a. m." (Southern Textile Bulletin, Vol. XV (July 11, 1918), p. 4, Charlotte, N. C.)

During the summer of 1918, just after the United States child-labor act had been declared unconstitutional, 53 mills and factories in 12 different localities situated in both the eastern and western districts of North Carolina were visited by officers of the Child-Labor Division of the Children's Bureau. In some instances the officers were detained in the mill or factory office until many of the children had been sent home and in others the children ran or hid as the officer approached, so that all the children employed in the factories visited were not interviewed. Occasionally objection was made by the management to the inspection, and acting under instructions the officers of the Child-Labor Division did not press the matter.

Of the 53 mills and factories inspected, children were employed in violation of the State law in 47 factories and in violation of the Federal standard in 52. In the inspection of 109 mills and factories made in North Carolina prior to June 3, when the United States child-labor law was operative, 50 were found violating the Federal standards. Prior to June 3, 95 children under 14 years of age were found employed in 30 of the 109 factories inspected. Table IX shows that in the 53 factories inspected after June 3, 622 children under 14 years of age were found at work, and 430 were employed in violation of the age provisions of the North Carolina law. Ninety-one of these children were under 10 years of age—2 were only 5 years of age, 9 were 6 years, 9 were 7, 28 were 8, and 43 were 9 years of age.

TABLE IX.—*Number of mills and factories inspected in North Carolina after June 3, 1918, and number of children employed in violation of Federal and State age and hour standards in these mills and factories, by industry.*

Industry.	Mills and factories inspected.	Children employed in violation of Federal and State age and hour standards.					
		Age.		Hour.		Night work.	
		Federal.[1]	State.[2]	Federal.[3]	State.[4]	Federal.[5]	State.[6]
Total	53	622	430	1,092	12	25	25
Cotton goods	23	227	151	450	9	13	13
Knit goods	12	140	86	262	1	12	12
Other textile goods	1	1	1	2	.....	.....	.....
Tobacco (including stemmed and assorted tobacco)	10	185	148	261	2	.....	.....
Furniture	4	37	18	75	.....	.....	.....
Paper boxes	2	20	15	26	.....	.....	.....
Men's clothing	1	12	11	16	.....	.....	.....

[1] Under 14 years of age.
[2] Under 12 years of age, and under 13 years of age without certificates.
[3] Between 14 and 16 years of age working over 8 hours a day or 48 hours a week.
[4] Between 12 and 16 years of age working over 11 hours a day or 60 hours a week.
[5] Between 14 and 16 years of age working after 7 p. m. or before 6 a. m.
[6] Between 12 and 16 years of age working between 9 p. m. and 6 a. m.

Change from the eight-hour to the long day for the North Carolina children followed promptly the decision that the Federal law was un-

constitutional, and the employment of children under 14 years of age was greatly increased. In the mills and factories visited the children were usually employed the same number of hours as the adult workers. In one cotton mill in which, when inspected in November, 1917, no violations of the Federal standards had been found, the inspection made on August 6, 1918, showed 17 children between 9 and 14 years of age and 15 children between 14 and 16, all working 11 hours a day. In another mill inspected on December 20, 1917, 1 child under 14 years of age was at work, and the children between 14 and 16 were working only 8 hours a day. On August 8, 1918, 25 children from 8 to 14 years of age and 49 between 14 and 16 were working 11 hours a day. In a knitting mill inspected on May 9, 1918, no violations were found. On August 1, 8 children from 12 to 14 years of age and 14 between 14 and 16 were working 11 hours a day. In a large tobacco factory, where records for 326 children were reported to be on file at the time the Federal law was declared unconstitutional, the superintendent said that all the children in the factory were at the time of this inspection working 10 hours a day, and that many of the children who had been refused Federal certificates prior to June 3, because evidence that they were 14 or over could not be furnished, were now being employed. The superintendent told the inspector that he had State certificates which had been issued since June 3, 1918, for 150 children who were 12 and 13 years old. A complete inspection was not made of this factory, but 18 of these children were interviewed and are included in the totals given.

TABLE X.—*Number of mills and factories inspected in North Carolina after June 3, 1918, and number of children employed in violation of Federal and State age and hour standards under 10 years of age in these mills and factories, by industry.*

Industry.	Mills and factories inspected.	Children under 10 years of age employed.				
		Total.	Male.	Female.	White.	Colored.
Total	19	91	56	35	45	46
Cotton goods	8	20	13	7	20	.....
Knit goods	5	10	5	5	10	.....
Tobacco	4	54	35	19	8	46
Furniture	1	1	1	.....	1	.....
Men's clothing	1	6	2	4	6	.....

Table X shows by industries the sex and color of the children under 10 years of age found at work in the course of these inspections. The 45 white children employed were distributed among all the different industries inspected, although the largest number were in the cotton mills. The 46 colored children were all working in tobacco factories.

The hours of the 91 children under 10 years of age employed in the factories visited were often very long. Thus, 1 was working

12 hours, 13 were working 11 or between 11 and 12 hours a day, 58 were working 10 or between 10 and 11 hours a day, 6 were working 9 or between 9 and 10 hours a day, and the remainder, 8 hours or less. One 9-year-old girl, who was helping her mother thread tensions at a mill, worked 11 hours in the mill with her mother on August 8, 1918; she returned to work at night, and her father said she would be there until perhaps 9.30 or 10 o'clock.

In the mills which were found working day and night shifts, 25 children under 16 years of age were employed on the night shift. The employment of children under 16 after 9 p. m., it should be remembered, was contrary to the State law. Two brothers aged 12 and 9 were found helping an older sister on alternate nights at one mill. On the night the inspector visited this mill, the 12-year-old boy was observed pushing a truck of bobbins around the spinning frames; later the same night he was found asleep on his bobbin truck.

The mills inspected that were doing night work ran continuously from Monday morning to Saturday noon. In these mills the pay rolls showed that the employees worked 12 hours for 5 nights, or 60 hours a week, which was the usual working week for the day shift.

Children who were found at work in violation of the law of North Carolina were employed in cotton and hosiery mills, in tobacco, paper box, men's clothing, and furniture factories. The occupations in which they were engaged varied greatly. In the cotton mills children as young as 10, 11, and 12 had regular jobs as doffers, spinners, winders, quill boys, spoolers, banders, and sweepers. The very young children, aged 8 and 9 years, who came in with an older brother or sister, parent or neighbor, were found assisting in the spinning and spooling. They put in the bobbins, pulled down ends, threaded tensions and shuttles, or filled batteries in the weave room.

In the hosiery mills children as young as 11, 12, and 13 sometimes had regular jobs—topping, knitting, labeling, looping, pairing, and folding. Still younger children, 8, 9, and 10 years old, helped by turning socks, tying bundles, clipping, and threading tensions. The top of a sock is knit by one machine and the lower part by another machine. Before the top is put on the second machine it must be put over a disk and raveled back. In the factories inspected, toppers were often assisted in this operation by very young children.

The 7 tobacco factories which employed 148 children under 12 years of age, or 12 years of age without certificates, were the worst offenders against the North Carolina law. Children from 5 to 14 years of age were found working at stemming, tying, tagging, capping, tucking, and packing. They also caught the packages off the belts, and spread the tobacco. A child of 5 was found stemming and sorting leaves in one of the large tobacco factories inspected.

In the furniture factories boys 10, 11, 12, and 13 were found working regularly at gluing, sanding, staining, tailing, packing, chucking, and driving dowell pins. One boy of 6 years was "helping" in the factory and running errands.

In the paper-box factories, boys and girls 10 to 13 years of age were at work tying, tucking, lidding boxes, and pasting. In one of the men's clothing factories inspected, a 12-year-old child ran a button machine, and 7 children, 1 as young as 7, were clipping threads. The management reported that during the period when the Federal child-labor law was in force it had been found necessary to use old women for this work.

Some of the young children employed in violation of the State law were on the pay roll and were given individual pay envelopes. Children as young as 10 years were found on the pay roll in one mill; and in others children as young as 10 and 11 years received individual pay envelopes. The wages of most of the children employed in violation of the State law were put in the pay envelope of an older sister or brother, or an older employee who was paid by the piece. Sometimes this older person himself hired and paid the child who assisted him. At one cotton mill a 10-year-old child who worked as a sweeper had his pay put in the envelope of a 12-year-old brother. In a men's clothing factory a 9-year-old girl drew the pay for herself and her 7-year-old sister, both of whom worked the same hours as the "big" girls. In the same factory a 10-year-old girl received her pay in the envelope of a 12-year-old sister whose name was on the pay roll. At one mill, 8 children ranging in age from 9 to 12 were employed as battery fillers by weavers who were not always relatives of the children.

In North Carolina little if any attempt was being made by many of the mills to keep children not at work out of the factory building. As a result, the number of children about a mill was often larger than the number employed; but the officers of the Child-Labor Division made no attempt to obtain a record of those not observed at work. Children were sometimes encouraged to come with their mothers and remain at the factories so that the labor of the mother might be utilized. One manager said that, while he did not offer any inducement to the children to come into the factory building, he did nothing to keep them out. The superintendent of a tobacco factory reported having hired a woman since June 3, 1918, who had been forced to stay at home to care for her children when the Federal child-labor law was operative. After it was declared void the mothers brought the children to work with them; and according to the superintendent, the children slept curled up under the benches, sometimes all morning. At one factory, where seven very young children were employed clipping threads, the manager said they did

not work much during the day but played about the factory and occasionally went down into the yard to play. Some of the managers complained of the presence of these small children who did not work. Under efficient factory management they would have been excluded because of the danger of accidents, because of the confusion they created, and because of the slight production capacity of those who did work. For their own sake they should have been excluded on other and much more important grounds.

It has been frequently said in this report that a good certificating system is the most effective means of enforcing a child-labor law. Unless the evidence of age is carefully canvassed, an employer who desires to obey the law can not be sure that he is doing so. The certificating provisions of the North Carolina law were entirely inadequate, and, unfortunately, not even the few requirements of the State law were being observed in 1918.

In no factory inspected were the certificates required by the North Carolina law kept on file for all the 12 and 13 year old children. One mill manager who was quite familiar with the certificating requirements under the Federal law had never heard of a State certificate. The manager of another said that he was trying to maintain a 12-year-old standard in his mill, and that he had State certificates on file for all the children in his employ. On checking over the names of the children employed it was found that there was a State certificate on file for only 1 of the 30 children employed on that date. He had, however, a number of State certificates for children who had formerly worked at the mill but had left. At another mill there were no certificates on file for children employed at this mill at the time of the investigation, but some old certificates issued in 1914 were submitted to the officers of the Child-Labor Division. One cotton mill and one box factory had forms which they said they intended to use. These provided for the parent's statement of the child's age and his attendance at school at least 4 months in the preceding 12 months. However, none had been filled out for the children employed. One tobacco company used a similar form, and certificates of this sort were on file for a few of the 12-year-old children employed.

In none of the factories visited was there found a statement or certificate issued by the local educational authority, showing that the child had attended school 4 months in the preceding 12. In only one was there any recognition that the statement to the effect that the school-attendance law had been complied with should be obtained from the school. In this mill the management stated that the teacher of the mill school had been instructed to leave the attendance book at the mill; but when the overseer was asked by the management to produce it, the book could not be found.

Records for public schools in the country and mill schools are often very poorly kept. In one town many children whose names appeared on the school census could not be found on the attendance records. Because of the incompleteness of the records kept, the conclusion that the large number not enrolled had never attended the school was not warranted. It was equally impossible to conclude that they had attended the four months required by the law of North Carolina.

The number of children under 14 who were put to work for long hours as soon as the Federal law was declared unconstitutional was perhaps no larger than might have been expected. No regular inspections were being made under the State law. While a few manufacturers are always ready to violate any law, this number increases rapidly if those who violate go unpunished, for the manufacturer who prefers to keep the law finds it increasingly difficult to do so. The standards of the North Carolina law were low, but the lack of enforcement was even more serious. Although there was a State commissioner of labor and printing, the enforcement of the child-labor law was given to the county superintendents of schools, who were provided with no funds for factory inspection. Without the approval which special provisions for funds would have given, it was impossible for local officers to attempt enforcement of the law. In the past, the manufacturers of North Carolina had opposed State factory inspection; therefore it was encouraging that at the meeting previously referred to [19] the North Carolina Cotton Manufacturers' Association recommended a new child-labor law for North Carolina and urged that the law should "contain such provisions as are necessary to enforce and make effective said law." [20]

Ohio.

The Ohio child-labor law of 1913 set a new standard in child-labor legislation. It established a minimum working age of 15 years for boys and of 16 years for girls and an educational minimum which required completion of the sixth grade for boys and the seventh grade for girls. It prohibited the employment of boys under 16 and of girls between 16 and 18 more than 8 hours a day, 48 hours a week, or 6 days a week, or between 6 p. m. and 7 a. m.; the employment of boys between 16

[19] See p. 112, footnote 18.

[20] The enforcement of the law enacted in 1919 was given, after much discussion, to the State child-welfare commission, composed of the State superintendent of public instruction, the secretary of the State board of health, and the commissioner of public welfare. The law also gives to the commission a power which may be used to defeat the whole purpose of the act; namely, the power to decide cases and prescribe regulations for the employment of children under 11 years of age. The agents appointed by this commission are given power to enter and inspect all establishments coming within the scope of the act. The act also leaves to the commission the decision as to the form, conditions under which, and persons by whom, the certificates of age shall be issued. Supervision of the enforcement of the compulsory-education provisions of the act is similarly lodged with the State board of education, so that it is now possible for North Carolina to avoid the confusion from which so many States are suffering because of the complete decentralization in the issuance of certificates and enforcement of compulsory school-attendance laws.

and 18 after 10 p. m. was also prohibited. A preliminary examination to establish physical fitness was required before a child could get a work permit; and these permits the law required must be secured and kept on file by the employer for boys of 15 and for girls between 16 and 18 years of age. The Ohio statutory standards were therefore much higher than the standards set by the United States child-labor act of September 1, 1916, or than those adopted by the War Labor Policies Board.

Ohio inspections made by the Child-Labor Division during June, July, and August, 1918, were confined to the glass and pottery industries along the Ohio River from the East Liverpool district to Wheeling and west to Columbus and Cincinnati, one of the most important centers for these industries in the United States. In their work the Federal inspectors had the cooperation of the State factory inspector, and they made a report to him of the children whom they found employed.

The glass factories in this district were manufacturing bottles, food containers, tumblers, and other tableware, druggist glass, magnifying glasses, automobile lenses, lantern and lighting globes, and art glass for churches and public buildings.

The Ohio pottery district is one of the oldest and most important in the United States. China tableware, stoneware jars and cooking utensils, electrical and chemical porcelains, vases and art potteries, heavy sanitary ware, floor and wall tiles are all produced in potteries which vary much in size, number of employees, and general conditions.

In 81 of the 95 plants inspected, violations of the State child-labor laws were found. As the State standards were higher than the Federal, there were fewer violations of Federal standards; still, in 62 establishments (65 per cent of the entire number inspected) there were violations of the Federal age and hour standards. The youngest child found at work was 8 years old, another was 9, 2 children were 10, 12 were 11 years old, 12 were 12, and 71 were 13 years old, making a total of 99 children under 14 employed in violation of the Federal age standard. The State standard was further violated by the employment of 173 boys and girls 14 years old and 55 girls 15 years old, making a total of 327 found at work who were below the minimum age limit fixed by the Ohio State law.

Illegal overtime employment was also common. The Ohio law prohibited the employment in factories, etc., of boys 15 to 16 years of age more than 8 hours a day, or before 7 a. m. or after 6. p. m., and of boys between 16 and 18 after 10 p. m. Girls under 18 were restricted to an 8-hour day, and employment between 6 p. m. and 7 a. m. was prohibited. There were 172 children under 16 years of age who were employed more than 8 hours a day in violation of the

Federal standard, and 63 girls between 16 and 18 years of age who were employed more than that number of hours in violation of the Ohio law. There were 100 children employed at night in violation of the Ohio law; only 48 of these were under 16 years of age and so covered by the Federal standards.

The violation of the night-work standards established by the State law was most frequent in the glass factories, where boys of 16 and 17 years of age worked after 10 o'clock on the late night shift. The glass factories were running regularly at night at the time the inspections were made, and in most of them there was apparently no effort to keep the younger boys off the night shifts. Every other week, or every third week, according to the arrangement of shifts and hours in the individual factory, the boys took their turns with the other workers. The numbers given above, therefore, do not represent the entire number of boys who were doing night work, but only those on the night shift at the time the inspections were made. In a few places the management recently had replaced the boys with colored women, so that the younger boys had been eliminated.

Among the potteries, violations of the 8-hour day were also frequent. A 9-hour day was common in the tile works, and in some departments of both glass and pottery factories the children were not dismissed at the end of 8 hours. Very long hours of overtime were less frequently found. However, one small boy was found still running to the leer with his regular loads of hot ware after he had been at work 17 out of the 24 hours. He had begun at 7 in the morning of the preceding day and had had an hour and a quarter off at noon. His shift quit at 4.45 in the afternoon, but the next shift was one boy short, so this boy was induced to continue again from 4.45 p. m. to 2.15 a. m., with one hour off from 9 to 10 p. m. The time clock recorded these hours. Shortly after 7 o'clock of the following day, when the inspector of the Child-Labor Division discovered these facts, the boy was sent home by the foreman. In another factory the smaller boys hung around to get a chance to work as "spares" to relieve the regular boys as a second shift took their places. These "spare" boys often worked 10 and 15 hours a day.

The posting of lists of minors whose working hours are especially regulated by statute is an administrative help in the enforcement of such laws. The Ohio law required the posting of such lists, and also required the posting of the working hours of boys under 18 and girls under 21. In the factories inspected in the East Liverpool district not one list of minors was posted, and in only one of them was a schedule of hours posted.

The glass industry is an old employer of children. Like the cotton mill, the shop equipment in the old-style factory was devised on the assumption that small boys were to be used. For this reason the

molds are sometimes built so near the ground that only a small child could crouch beneath their handles, or the space provided for the "snapping-up" boy is not large enough for anyone but a small child to use.[21]

As in other industries in which children have been employed, the belief has been current that in order to master the trade the worker must begin as a child. It offers few opportunities for advancement, as only a small per cent of the children who work in glass factories secure apprenticeship positions which enable them to become skilled workmen; while the physical strain of the work, the intense heat, the dust and fumes make it so undesirable an occupation for children that it has been the center of attack in child-labor legislation.

The occupations in which the children who were found working in Ohio were engaged made both age and hour violations peculiarly serious. In the glass factories approximately one-third of them were employed in the furnace rooms, usually as mold boys, snapping-up boys, machine boys, and especially as carrying-in boys. The mold boy opens and closes the molds for the skilled glass blower as he blows the molten glass into the mold form. In some places the mold boy squats on the floor in a cramped posture, in others the molds are so placed that he stands in a stooped position over his work. Occasionally he must speed up so as to keep the molds in readiness for two blowers. The inspectors counted some who were turning out 10 and 12 small bottles per minute. Added to the cramped position and speed, these boys have to endure the extreme heat always present in the furnace room. In contrast to the stationary work of the mold boy, the snapping-up boy is in constant motion, picking up the hot ware from the mold boy and carrying it from the blower's position to the finisher, a distance of 5 to 10 feet in the usual arrangement of the furnace room. He too is exposed to excessive heat. Work on the blowing or pressing machines is frequently done by boy helpers in transferring the ware from the press and sticking it up; these helpers are classed together as "machine boys." Next to the mold boys, these machine boys are most constantly subjected to the highest degree of heat, as the machine stands close to the furnace opening. However, there is one alleviating feature—cold air currents are introduced above the machine in order to keep the pressers from becoming overheated afford the boys some relief.

In all but the very few glass factories where automatic conveyors had been installed, boys were employed in carrying the glassware from the machines to the leer. This has to be done quickly, as the product ought not to be exposed long to the outer air. The carrying-in boys made these trips constantly from the hot zone of the furnace

[21] Report on the conditions of Woman and Child Wage Earners in the United States, vol. 3, Glass Industry, p. 201. U. S. Bureau of Labor, Washington, 1911.

room to the hot openings of the leer, usually a distance of from 15 to 50 feet. They carried the ware on long-handled paddles which had to be carefully kept in a horizontal position. Although the weight carried was insignificant, there were eight to nine hours of muscular tension in carrying the paddle and 5 or more miles a day to walk, during which the boys were exposed alternately to the fatiguing heat of the furnace and the cold drafts of outdoor air in winter.

Although some schemes for reducing the radiation of heat have been worked out, at best it is terrific in the furnace room, where the tank of molten glass is heated to a temperature of from 2,000 to 3,000°, and where there are also the "glory holes," [22] the hot molds, and the machines.

A night inspection was made of a furnace room when the outside temperature was 91°, but where the machine boys worked the mercury jumped quickly to 122°.[23] The roof of the furnace room was low, the room was small and crowded, so the possibility of any cross draft was shut off, and the tank was constructed so that the prevailing summer breezes had no access to the room. The distance to the leer was short and the floor space was filled with hurrying workers dodging each other. According to the inspector, the boys would work a few minutes and then, relieved by the spare boys, throw themselves down in exhaustion on the ground outside. The ice-water tanks had to be replenished frequently. Some of the maturer men had brought supplies of oat-meal water from home—which, they said, did not taste so good as ice water, but they knew was better for them.

The unit of work in the furnace room is the "shop," consisting of six or seven employees—three skilled men, blowers and finishers; and three or four boys who assist. The work of the shop is very much crippled if even one boy fails to appear for work, and the skilled men sometimes are obliged to remain idle because of the scarcity of helpers. Work in glass houses is conducted in shifts, sometimes two and sometimes three in 24 hours, and it is when the shifts change that the spare boys get their chance to work in the next "turn," for if the incoming shop finds itself short of mold boys, snapping-up boys, machine boys, or carrying-in boys, the boys experienced in these occupations who are just leaving work remain for the next shift. So it frequently happens that the dangers of excessively long hours are added to the other hazards of the industry—burns, cuts from the broken glass which is usually on the floor, and the far graver danger

[22] These are small reheating furnaces, used solely for partially reheating such articles as have become too cool for working before all the desired shaping processes have been completed.

[23] In the investigation of the glass workers made in 1910 (see footnote 21, p. 120), it was found that in June the mold boy finds the temperature averages 19° warmer where he is working than outside; the machine boy, 23°; the carrying-in boy, from 2° to 24° where he takes up the ware. The mold and machine boys are permanently in the heat zone, but the carrying-in boys do get away from it on each journey they take to the leer.

of disease resulting from extreme heat, exposure to sudden changes of temperature, and fatigue.[24]

The employment of children in glass factories has been greatly reduced in the last 25 years by child-labor legislation, by the introduction of automatic machinery, and by the use of adults for work formerly done only by children.

In the potteries the boys and girls were occupied chiefly as mold runners or mold boys, as dippers' helpers, and as finishers or brushers, spongers, and fettlers.

The mold boys were kept busy bringing the molds to the jiggerman, and, as soon as the jiggerman finished, carrying the molded green ware to the drying racks. If the drying ovens were some distance away and the jiggerman was turning out small pieces, his boy had to increase his speed to keep up with the wheels' output. The other workers in this division of the process were the finishers, who scraped the rapidly moving ware with a knife to remove unevenness and then smoothed it with a damp sponge.

Although the clay was wet when molded, it became constantly drier, and there was dust in the atmosphere rising from the dry clay drippings. The finishers' scrapings fell on the clothing of the workers and on the benches and the floors of the oven rooms. Passages showed dust accumulations that were brushed off in the removal of the dried ware. The workers all ran an unnecessary dust hazard, as the potteries visited were not equipped with exhaust systems for the removal of the dust. The buildings were usually old, the ceilings were low, and the floors rough and uneven. Sweeping up the dust was the common method of cleaning; the floors were sometimes sprinkled, but this precaution was not effective in keeping down the dust. The mold racks were so arranged around the worker that through currents of air were cut off, the overheated oven usually occupied the center of the room, so that the workrooms were hot in summer and not adequately heated in winter.

After the green ware was dried and brushed, the next process was known as dipping, which consisted in applying a liquid coating to the ware, which after exposure to intense heat in the glost kiln hardened into a glaze.

The glaze dipping was done in similarly insanitary rooms with low ceilings, rough wooden floors, and dark corners. But in addition there was the special hazard from the white lead used in the glaze.

[24] See Hayhurst, E. R.: Industrial Health Hazards and Occupational Diseases in Ohio. Ohio State Board of Health, 1915, pp. 258 ff. Referring to the work of the boys in connection with the glass blowing by hand, Dr. Hayhurst says: "The work is not unduly *fatiguing* to normal adults, especially after a little experience, but many youths were found to be doing exhausting labor. This feature was rendered much worse by the heat. Other fatigue factors were piecework, speeding up, monotony, constant standing for some, faulty postures (of sedeutary workers), and lifting and straining, especially for youths. While all helpers, including the boys, were paid on a day-work plan, they were required to keep up with the skilled glass blowers who worked piecework in nearly all places." (p. 269.)

Minors employed in the dipping process were usually the helpers, who took the ware from the dipper after he had immersed it by hand into the tub of glaze. In the tile factories the glaze was usually applied by machinery. Occasionally girls and boys did the dipping. While the glaze was wet there was no danger of poisoning, but the workers were careless and splashed it about on clothing and floors, where it dried and then became dangerous.

The dippers' helpers also sponged and rubbed off the excess glaze from the foot of the ware or scraped it with a knife, washed away the dust, and stacked the ware on boards which they carried to the glost kiln. The glaze dried quickly and the boards became dusty also. A boy was seen to knock two boards together to clean off the dust. It was not unusual to see deposits of dust on the face and clothing, and the workers were reckless in shaking out their clothes and took few precautions in changing clothes. They even ate their lunches where they worked, for the majority of potteries inspected were without wash and lunch rooms.

Another dusty process in which many minors were engaged was the finishing of the glazed ware. Usually the articles had been previously kilned, so there was no danger of lead poisoning. The little imperfections and projections of the glaze were scraped off with a small knife or rubbed off with sand. This was frequently spoken of as fettling, or finishing. It was done in the manufacture of the finer grades of white ware, but rarely in the art and stoneware potteries. The work was dusty, especially where the scouring was done with bristle wheels, and no blower system was provided for dust removal.

In the art ware potteries there were special dangers in the decorating processes known as color spraying and paint dipping, as the colors were often rich in lead. In some of the potteries inspected young girls were employed in the occupation of tinting. This was done in a hood, which, however, permitted the escape of a certain amount of spray, as the girls' hands and aprons and the surfaces outside of the hoods were also tinted. Color dipping, at which boys were employed, had the same danger as glaze dipping.

While conditions in the potteries of Ohio have improved in recent years, children were found in the course of these inspections working at occupations in which they were exposed to the danger of lead poisoning as well as to dust and overfatigue. The Ohio law enumerated a list of occupations in which the employment of children under 16 was prohibited. Among these were processes in which acids, poisonous gases, or dyes, etc., are used in the manufacture or packing of paints and white or red lead. The law further gave to the State board of health the power of determining whether any other trade, occupation, or process was dangerous to children under 16 and under

18 years of age, and to prohibit their employment at occupations determined dangerous. There is thus ample legislation for the protection of children both against occupations dangerous to their health as well as against their premature and excessive employment.

Much of the illegal employment of children in Ohio is due to the failure to carry out the work permit or certificating provisions of the law. Ohio was designated under section 5 of the United States child-labor law in the group of States whose legislative requirements with reference to certificating were substantially equivalent to those of the Federal rules and regulations. In Ohio, as in most States, employment certificates were issued by the school authorities. The child was required by law to furnish (1) a promise of employment, (2) a record signed by the principal of the school showing that the educational requirements of the law have been met, (3) documentary proof of age,[25] and (4) a certificate from the school physician showing him to be fit to be employed in any of the occupations permitted by law. Special vacation certificates were issued to children who could meet all except the educational requirements for a regular certificate.

An employer was required to keep certificates on file for all boys between 15 and 16 years of age, and girls between 16 and 18 years of age. Boys were required to have completed the sixth and girls the seventh grade in school. The law thus established an age, an educational, and a physical minimum. The proof of age required by the State statute gave the legal basis for a good certificating system. But the investigations made by the Child-Labor Division in the summer of 1918 showed that in the cities and towns visited the certificating law was violated and ignored in practice, and no attempt was made to use it to prevent the employment of children in occupations where they were exposed to lead poisoning or dust hazards.

The forms used as certificates in the cities and towns visited would fit together like the pieces in a crazy quilt. They varied in size from legal cap to small scraps of paper. This was confusing to employers. Because of this lack of uniformity, they became accustomed to accepting anything offered as a certificate by the child The certificates also came from other sources than the public schools, illegally issued, but the employer's attention was rarely directed to that phase of it. In one city the superintendent of schools refused to issue certificates to parochial school children, so the priest gave the children statements of the grades they had completed. In three other cities "permits" were issued by the priests, sometimes to children who could not meet the age or schooling requirements. These permits usually read: "I do not object to the employment of ——— (child's name)." In another city children from the parochial school were

[25] Proof of age in the following order is required by the statute (*a*) Passport, certificate of birth or baptism, or other religious record showing date and place of birth (*b*) Transcript of birth certificate filed with registrar of vital statistics (*c*) Other documentary evidence. (*d*) Physician's certificate of age.

allowed to work without certificates. In most of the towns visited the legal documentary evidence of age was not required by the superintendent of schools before certificates were issued. Few of them could give offhand the kind of evidence and the order of preference which the State law specified. The children were sometimes charged a fee of 35 cents for birth-registration certificates. This was a real hardship to the children, and one superintendent offered it as his excuse for not requiring the best proof of age obtainable.

In one city the superintendent of schools issued so-called vacation certificates to children 13, 14, and 15 years of age, giving his permission that they be "employed at light labor during vacation in occupations not forbidden by law." The employment of children of those ages was clearly "forbidden by law"; but these permits, which were carefully worded to protect the superintendent from the charge of having illegally issued certificates, were accepted by the employer as a legal permit to employ the children for whom they were issued. In this town documentary proof of the child's age and a physical examination were not required. One superintendent justified the issuing of certificates to children under the legal age by an opinion of the attorney general of Ohio rendered in 1912. This was to the effect that certificates were required "only for employment during the school term," and that the "undoubted legislative intent [was] to prevent child labor only in so far as it interferes with schooling."[26] The compulsory-education and child-labor laws, however, had been amended since the opinion of the attorney general was rendered, and the law stated specifically that the only requirement which could be waived in issuing special vacation permits was the completion of the sixth grade in school. In another town the issuing officer accepted a parent's affidavit as proof of age, although this was contrary to the State law. In two towns school records were accepted without any verification. One superintendent thought the children were better off at work than idle and, quite regardless of the provisions of the law, had given oral and sometimes written consent to the employment of boys 13 and 14 years of age. Statements of age and education were issued for children to work in West Virginia whose employment would be illegal in Ohio. Sometimes the children changed their jobs, and these permits also were found in the files of Ohio employers.

The requirement that an authorized physician examine each child and certify his physical fitness legally to work was in many towns entirely ignored, or the examination was given in an altogether perfunctory manner. This was especially to be regretted for

[26] Ohio School Laws: Blank forms and directions to serve as a guide for school officers and teachers. Compiled under the direction of Frank W. Miller, superintendent of public instruction. Columbus, Ohio, 1915, p. 280.

children whose work, because of dust, heat, or lead, exposed them to peculiar health hazards.

Under the Ohio law a so-called juvenile examiner could be appointed in cities by the board of education to pass on the educational qualifications of all applicants for permits. If a child was found by this examiner to be below normal in mental development, so that he could not with "due industry" meet the educational requirements of the law, and if the school record showed the child to be below normal in development, this fact was to be certified to by the examiner and the superintendent might then issue a certificate to the child. Obviously the juvenile examiner should have been a doctor or a psychologist qualified to make a scientific determination of the child's mental development. The scientific work done by the Cincinnati bureau in testing the mental development of applicants for work permits has attracted national attention. Unfortunately, not all the Ohio work is so good. In two towns included in the investigation probate judges had been appointed juvenile examiners. One of these judges had issued a permit to a boy whose school record gave no evidence that he was subnormal mentally. He had requested that the issuing of employment certificates for delinquent children be left entirely to him, and had advised the schools "to allow any child over 14 to have a vacation certificate." The other judge who was a juvenile examiner had given many "papers" to children whose school records indicated they were normally bright children. Six weeks before school closed a boy not then 14 years old was given a permit by the juvenile examiner which read: "In so far as this court is concerned the bearer, * * * may be employed during vacation by any person or firm using the services of said person in employment suitable for one of his age." The truant officer who issued certificates for the schools said that he refused to honor the juvenile examiner's recommendations when they were made for children whom the school records showed to be under the legal age, but the judge's certificates were apparently as readily accepted by employers as regularly issued certificates.

The most flagrant assumption of authority in issuing employment certificates was in an industrial community 12 miles north of Cincinnati. Here two mayors had furnished children, several of whom were under age, with "working papers." One of these was in the form of a written note which read: "This is to certify that [child's name] says she is 16 years old. * * * My consent is hereby given them to work."

All these various kinds of permits, or working papers, were found in the office files in the factories visited by the inspectors of the Child-Labor Division. But there were 200 boys and 105 girls found employed for whom, under the Ohio law, certificates should have been on file, but for whom no certificates of any kind were found.

The Ohio law did not require supervision of the issuing of certificates by any State officer, but an opportunity for this was given in the requirement that the superintendents make monthly reports to the industrial commission of the certificates issued, returned, and refused. Forms for such reports had been drawn up by the commission when the law went into effect, but many of the superintendents in the towns visited were not sending them in, and some said they had never heard that such reports were required.

The superintendents in these Ohio towns did not desire to shirk the responsibilities which were theirs under the law. It should be remembered that these inspections were made in the summer of 1918, when the pressure of the industrial demands for the prosecution of the war was greatest. While a few of the factories had war contracts, most of them were engaged in the production of nonessentials. As the adult labor was drawn off, some employers were trying to keep their industries going by employing children. The talk of patriotic obligation to work had confused some of the superintendents. Thus one of them wrote: "* * * under present conditions they [children under age] should be expected and encouraged to do that [work]." Some of the superintendents felt that they were justified in breaking the law by granting certificates to children under the legal age, because of "economic necessity." Some of them, ignorant of the physical hazards of the employment into which the children were going, felt that the girls and boys were better off at work than idle during the summer months. Wise parents who have the means provide occupations for their children during the summer which will give them the physical recreation they need and develop a sense of responsibility for the completion of tasks undertaken. But a furnace room in a glass factory, or a dusty room in a pottery, which these school superintendents were approving for children under the legal age, is a dangerous and costly remedy for the evils which result from poverty, or from a failure on the part of the community to provide educational recreation for children during the summer.

A number of the towns included in the Ohio investigation were along the West Virginia and Pennsylvania boundary line. In West Virginia the minimum age for both girls and boys was 14; there was no limitation of the hours of work for children between 14 and 16 years of age, and night work was not prohibited. In Ohio girls under 18 and boys under 16 years of age could not be employed more than eight hours per day, and night work was prohibited. West Virginia's standards were therefore very much lower than those of Ohio.[27] Attention was first drawn to the problem these differences created in the inspections made in West Virginia near the Ohio line during the

[27] The West Virginia standards were raised in 1919, but they are still below those of Ohio.

autumn of 1917 and again during the Ohio inspections in the summer of 1918, when the attention of an inspector was called to the young children crossing on the ferryboat from Ohio for night work in West Virginia.

The manufacturers complained bitterly of the fact that their competitors across the Ohio River did not have to observe as high standards, and parents and educators as well asked: "Why should girls of 15 who cross the river and work 10 or 12 hours a day in West Virginia not be allowed to work 8 hours in Ohio?" Seven factories were inspected across the line to see to what extent it was impossible, because of West Virginia's lower standards, for Ohio to give its children the protection it desired them to have.

Inspections were made of two plants near Wheeling which were manufacturing iron and steel pipes and tubes; a night inspection only was made in one and a day and night in the other. Altogether 81 children under 16 were found employed; 19 of these were under 14 years of age, 2 were 11, 6 were 12, and 11 were 13 years of age. Sixty-one of these children were working 12 hours five nights a week on shifts, with a 20-minute lunch period at midnight. All the children for whom time records could be found were working more than 8 hours a day. Both steel plants had affidavits (many of them false) for some of the boys in their employ, but no regularly issued certificates were on file. Of the 81 children under 16 employed in these mills contrary to the Ohio and the Federal standards, 44 lived in Ohio and came across daily to work in West Virginia.

Five potteries across the river from the East Liverpool district were also inspected. With one exception these were among the factories in West Virginia which had been inspected by the Child-Labor Division during the operation of the Federal law. Conditions were found to be fairly good in the summer of 1918, although one child 8 years of age and two 10 years of age were found at work. Two of the potteries had certificates on file for all the children of legal age, and three other factories inspected were employing no children under 14. So far as these potteries were concerned, the violations were no more frequent than among those in Ohio. The factories near Wheeling were an example of what could happen. Except through the compulsory-school law—which was no protection during the vacation season, when these inspections were made—the State of Ohio had provided no way of preventing its children from working nights, and for very long hours, in West Virginia.

Virginia.

After the Federal law was declared unconstitutional, 65 canneries and 38 other factories in Virginia were inspected by the Child-Labor Division. The latter were inspected at the request of the State com-

missioner of labor and in most cases jointly made with a State inspector. They were located in seven cities and towns in different parts of the State and included boot and shoe, textile, tobacco, trunk, paper-box, peanut, confectionery, overall, and other factories. Altogether, 31 children under 14 years of age were found employed in violation of the State and Federal standards in factories. Of the 586 children under 16 years of age who were found working in these factories, 572 had been changed from an 8-hour day to the 9 or 10 hour day permitted under the Virginia law as soon as the Federal law was declared unconstitutional. Many of the children when questioned concerning their hours of work asked eagerly if they were to go back to the eight-hour day. One employer had not heard the law had been declared unconstitutional and was still observing it; therefore the visit of the inspectors had the unfortunate effect of lengthening the day for the children in this factory.

The most flagrant violations were by a hosiery company which had two mills. In one the employees were white and in the other colored. In the former mill the underage children were hidden in the men's lavatory, and a group of men gathered around the door to prevent the inspector from entering.

The certificating situation showed very little improvement since the inspections in the fall and winter of 1917–18. The law passed in 1918 which provided for better proof of age had gone into effect. A form to be used by the notaries had been prepared by the commissioner of labor, but it was not found to be in general use. The notaries employed by the factories were in general doing their work much more carefully than the other notaries. Interviews with the latter showed them either quite ignorant of their duties or impatient because of the work which the law required for the small fee which could be collected. Old papers, affidavits several years old, illegally issued certificates which had been suspended by the inspectors of the Child-Labor Division, and Federal certificates issued while the Federal act was operative, were all found on file and were regarded by the employers as meeting the requirements of the State law. There were no certificates at all on file for 101 children between 14 and 16 years of age, although this constituted for each child a violation of the Virginia law.

The situation in the canneries was quite different from that in the factories generally. As in Maryland, the Virginia Legislature of 1918 in amending the State child-labor law included canneries in the list of industries prohibited from employing children under 14 years of age. But either through oversight or intent, the law did not include canneries in the penalty clause, and the attorney general ruled that because of this omission there was no way of compelling the canneries to obey the law. The canneries had thus been assured that because

of this omission they would not be interfered with if they violated the law. General cannery inspections had been planned by the Child-Labor Division because a number of States—Delaware, Indiana, Maryland,[28] Michigan, Tennessee, and Virginia[28]—exempted canneries[29] from some or all of the provisions of their State laws, and the Federal law set a higher standard than they had known before. When the law was declared unconstitutional these plans were abandoned, except for Maryland and Virginia. In Virginia inspections were made in August, 1918, in two districts—(1) on the Eastern Shore, especially in Middlesex and Lancaster Counties, and some in Gloucester, Northumberland, Westmoreland, and Accomac Counties; (2) in the western cannery district, especially in Botetourt, Bedford, Franklin, and Rockbridge Counties. In both districts most of the factories were canning tomatoes, but a few were canning beans and apples. The season for the canning of small fruits and the packing of shrimp, oysters, and crab meat was over. Some of the canneries were located in villages and relied upon the village labor supply; some were in the country and drew their workers from the surrounding district; while a few were only an extension of the farm work, and the members of the family were the only employees.

Both white and colored labor was used in the Virginia canneries, sometimes in the same factories. In the western district a larger per cent were white workers; in the eastern, colored labor was found in every factory visited except one. In only two localities were camps of imported laborers, which are so common in Maryland, found in Virginia. In one of these was a camp of Bohemian workers who had been brought from Baltimore; and Negroes who came from around Norfolk had been brought to a town in Accomac County, near the Eastern Shore of Maryland.

Altogether, 486 children under 16 years of age were interviewed in the course of these cannery inspections. Of this number 319, or approximately 66 per cent, were under 14 years of age, and 130, or 27 per cent, were under 12 years of age. These young children usually worked as pieceworkers in the peeling or preparation department. Some worked independently, and those too small to reach the peeling table stood on boxes and assisted their mothers or older sisters. A smaller number of children who were on a time basis of payment were engaged in various occupations—scalding, capping, hauling, or removing skins, handling cans, filling and trucking cases, and attending boilers.

The hours of work were irregular. Many of the canneries ran only three days a week, and the hours on these days varied. During the busy season the canneries usually began work at 7 in the morning

[28] Exemptions reduced in 1918, but law still not up to standards required for general factory employment.
[29] California exempted curing and drying of fruits.

and closed at 6 at night. On very rare occasions a factory would work at night to keep the fruit from spoiling. No time records were kept by the factory, and the statements of both parents and children varied greatly. Evidence was secured, however, showing that 263 children under 16 years of age usually worked more than eight hours a day. As the canneries were not included in the penalty clause of the Virginia law, they were not even limited to the 10-hour day, which is the legal working day for women and children in other Virginia factories.

In none of the canneries visited was a certificate of age on file—another evidence that the regulation of canneries was being entirely ignored. The cannery season was short and the children employed were mostly from local districts, so that few suffered either from continued long hours or the dangerous living conditions that are so general in the Maryland camps. But many of the tomato canneries were ugly places in which to work. Floors were covered with water and tomato juice, and wet clothing was common; and in some, unguarded machinery made the places in which children worked dangerous.

More recent inspections in Virginia were made in the late winter of 1918 and spring of 1919, in the various shipbuilding plants of the State. Of the 224 children under 16 found at work in these plants, 51 were proved to be under 14 years of age; certificates for only 62 children were found on file, and practically all these had been issued in violation of the provisions of the State law. No certificates were on file in one plant, in which 85 children were interviewed at their work—30 of whom, it was later proved, were under 14 years of age.

SECTION II. SPECIAL INSPECTIONS OF ESTABLISHMENTS ENGAGED IN WAR PRODUCTION.

The decision of the United States Supreme Court which, on June 3, 1918, declared unconstitutional the Federal child-labor act came at a time when effective legislative control of the employment of children was most urgently needed in this country. The inspections made by the Child-Labor Division in the summer following the decision of the court showed that many hundreds of children had been dependent upon the Federal law for their only protection against premature and excessive employment. This was found to be the case not only in States where the standards fixed by the State law were lower than those of the former Federal act but also in States where the State standards were equal to, or even higher than, the Federal.

While few, if any, of the States in which war emergency legislation had been passed authorizing the suspension of prewar standards [30] took advantage of this authority with reference to child labor, the reports of State and local officials generally testified to an increasing tendency to violations of the laws relating to the employment of children. Numerous instances were reported of State courts refusing to impose the penalty in cases of violation of the State law by manufacturers who were working on Government orders. In some cases State inspectors were even refused admission to plants engaged in filling war contracts on the ground that the employment of labor on work for the Federal Government was not subject to restrictions imposed by State laws, or because they had not received specific authority to make such inspections from the Government department with which the plant was under contract. With Federal protection withdrawn just when the pressure of war production was at its height, and when the supply of adult labor had been reduced by the withdrawal of over a million men into military service, and when the curtailment of nonessential industries had not yet begun, the only effective means of stemming the rush of young children into industry was lost in many States.

Fortunately the executives of the Federal Government had learned from the wartime experience of England and France the disastrous effect upon the military and industrial resources of the future of lowering the existing standards of protection afforded

[30] Such legislation was enacted shortly after the declaration of war by the United States in the following States: Connecticut, (ch. 326 of the laws of 1917, approved May 16, 1917); Massachusetts (ch. 342 of the laws of 1917, approved May 26, 1917); New Hampshire (ch. 194 of the laws of 1917, approved April 19, 1917); Vermont, (No. 172 of the laws of 1917, approved Apr. 12, 1917).

children. Already, while the Federal child-labor law of 1916 was in operation, orders had been issued by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy extending the application of its age and hour standards to navy yards, arsenals, and other Government reservations.[31]

When later the Federal child-labor law was declared unconstitutional, the seriousness of the situation was recognized by the Federal Government; and provision was made to remedy it, in so far as the executive branch of the Government had power, by extending the regulations already applicable to navy yards and arsenals to the many mills and factories over which the United States Government, as the largest purchasing agency in the world, had indirect control. Accordingly, on July 12, 1918, a little over a month after the Federal child-labor law was declared unconstitutional, the War Labor Policies Board, upon which were represented all the larger purchasing agencies of the Government—the War and Navy Departments, Shipping Board, Food Administration, and Housing Corporation—voted that the standards of the former Federal child-labor law be made a condition of all Government contracts. In order to insure the maintenance of State standards where these were higher than those of the Federal law, and to remove all doubt as to the applicability of State laws to goods manufactured for the Government by private concerns, the board also required that there should be included in each war contract a provision that all work required in the carrying out of the contract should be performed in full compliance with the law of the State in which such labor was performed. The complete text of the clause, which on the motion of the representative of the Secretary of War the board voted unanimously should be made a part of all war contracts, was as follows:

Laws and Restrictions Relative to Labor: All work required in carrying out this contract shall be performed in full compliance with the laws of the State, Territory, or District of Columbia, where such labor is performed: *Provided*, That the con-

[31] Shortly after the United States child-labor act of 1916 went into effect a complaint was received by the Children's Bureau relative to the employment of children in violation of the standards of the Federal act upon a certain Government reservation in establishments not engaged in interstate commerce, and to which, therefore, the Federal law did not apply. The complaint was brought to the attention of the Secretary of War, who, in order to make conditions in Army forts and posts conform to the standards laid down by the United States child-labor act, issued the following instructions through The Adjutant General: (1) That on Government reservations children under 14 years of age are not to be employed. (2) That children between 14 and 16 years of age are not to be employed (*a*) more than eight hours in any workday, (*b*) more than six days a week, (*c*) before 6 a. m. or after 7 p. m. (3) In order to enforce these standards it is desired that certificates be demanded and kept on file for every child between 14 and 16. (4) In determining whether children between 14 and 16 have been employed more than eight hours in any day the hours of employment shall be computed from the time the child is required or permitted or suffered to be at the place of employment up to the time when he leaves off work for the day, exclusive of a single continuous period of a definite length of time during which the child is off work and not subject to call. All employers on Government reservations shall be required to keep a daily time record showing the hours of employment for each and every child between 14 and 16 years of age.

A similar order applying to all naval districts, yards, and stations was issued by the Secretary of the Navy on January 5, 1918.

tractor shall not [directly or indirectly] employ in the performance of this contract any minor under the age of 14 years, or permit any minor between the age of 14 and 16 years to work more than eight hours in any one day, more than six days in any one week, or before 6 a. m. or after 7 p. m. Nor shall the contractor directly or indirectly employ any person undergoing sentence of imprisonment at hard labor which may have been imposed by a court of any State, Territory, or municipality having criminal jurisdiction: *Provided, however,* That the President of the United States may, by Executive order, modify this provision with respect to the employment of convict labor and provide the terms and conditions upon which such labor may be employed. This provision shall be of the essence of the contract.

On July 19 the War Labor Policies Board passed the following additional vote:

That the existing machinery of the Division of Child Labor, Children's Bureau, Department of Labor, should be utilized by all departments of the Government in administering the clause pertaining to the employment of children adopted by this board on July 12 and inserted in all departmental contracts.

Since the labor standards established by the proposed contract clause were enforceable not only through Federal provisions and Federal agencies, but also and more generally through State laws and State agencies, officials charged with the enforcement of the State labor laws were also deputized by the heads of the various production departments of the Federal Government to enforce the contract provisions with reference to labor. In order to explain to these officials their functions and those of the various Federal departments in the administration of these provisions, a conference of State labor officials was called by the War Labor Policies Board. This conference, which was held on September 30 and October 1, 1918, was attended by representatives of the departments of labor or factory inspection departments from practically all the States in which any considerable amount of war materials was being produced. Testimony of the officials attending the conference showed the immediate need for Federal cooperation in the maintenance of State standards.

In August a special appropriation was made available by the President to enable the Child-Labor Division to proceed with the inspections necessary for enforcement of the contract clause, in cooperation with the governmental purchasing agencies represented upon the War Labor Policies Board

The effective administration of the clause was from the beginning seriously hampered by the difficulty of securing prompt and complete information regarding the contracts awarded by the various Government departments. At the time when the War Labor Policies Board rulings with reference to contract provisions were made, there was no central agency in Washington receiving complete reports regarding war contracts from the various production departments. In the early months of the war, information regarding contracts placed by certain departments had been furnished to the Employment Service

of the Department of Labor, but these reports had been discontinued some time before the summer of 1918. Lists of contracts awarded by certain departments or bureaus, together with the names of the contractors, and also, in some cases, the nature and quantity of goods ordered, were published from time to time in the Official Bulletin issued by the Committee on Public Information. These lists were admittedly incomplete, and no information was furnished relative to the terms of the individual contracts.

The War Industries Board received somewhat more extensive reports regarding the terms of war orders, but for too limited a number of contracting concerns to be of any practical assistance in the administration of the contract clauses relative to labor. Even within the purchasing departments themselves, there was no centralization of information regarding contracts, each bureau having its own contract files and its own system of filing. A more serious hindrance to effective enforcement of the terms of the contract lay in the difficulty in securing reports of concerns awarded contracts in sufficient time to make the necessary inspections before the manufacture of the goods ordered had been completed. In many instances, moreover, the letting of contracts was not reported to the Washington headquarters of the contracting bureaus until a month or more after work actually had been begun toward their fulfillment. It was thus impossible even to know when the clauses began to be included in the contract forms of any one bureau until at least a month after this had occured.

In order to make it possible for the Child-Labor Division and the labor officials of the various States to render effective assistance in the enforcement of the contract clauses relating to labor, an effort was made by the War Labor Policies Board to secure the immediate and current reporting to some central agency of all war contracts awarded by the Government. Forms for these reports were outlined to contain the name and address of the contracting party, the names and addresses of subcontractors, if any, the number of the contract, the date on which it was made, the time, if specified, in which the contract was to be fulfilled, specifications regarding the nature and quantity of goods ordered, and a statement with reference to the inclusion of the labor clauses. Negotiations for the setting up of this machinery were unfortunately still pending at the time of the armistice, shortly after which the membership of the War Labor Policies Board was disbanded, and all the activities in which it as a board was engaged were brought to an end. It was therefore necessary for the Child-Labor Division to rely for its information regarding contracts solely upon the records secured by its own agents from the contract files of the various purchasing bureaus.

The first task of the division was to ascertain when the clauses became operative in the contract forms of the several Government departments and bureaus. The United States Housing Corporation of the Department of Labor was the first governmental agency actually to cause the insertion of the clause in its contract forms. Commencing about August 15, the child-labor provision was contained in all general construction contracts placed by this bureau. In the larger purchasing departments, the adoption of this clause was necessarily a somewhat slower process, because of the organization of these departments into numerous independent and decentralized purchasing agencies. For the War Department, for example, munitions, uniforms, and supplies were purchased by eight branches,[32] each operating widely scattered field offices through which the bulk of their purchases were made.

The War Department, whose representatives upon the War Labor Policies Board had introduced the resolution with reference to the child-labor contract clause, was the first of the larger departments to put into effect the action of the board. On August 30, the Director of Purchase, Storage, and Traffic, by authority of the Secretary of War, issued an order[33] directing that the provision be inserted in all formal fixed-price contracts thereafter made by the various supply bureaus of the War Department. In conformity with this order, arrangements were perfected for the insertion of the clause in the contracts placed by the various bureaus. By the early part of October new contract forms containing the clause were being put into general use by practically all the bureaus, and it is safe to say that by the time of the armistice the provision was contained in practically all contracts then being placed by the War Department.

The action of the War Department in ordering the insertion in its contracts of a clause restricting child labor appears to have met with little, if any, protest from manufacturing interests, with the exception of the cotton industry in the South. Because of their general refusal to accept orders under the prescribed conditions, only a very few contracts were placed by the Quartermaster Corps with the cotton manufacturers of the Southern States after the date on which the clause was generally inserted.[34]

---

[32] The Quartermaster Corps, Ordnance Department, Signal Corps, Air Service, Chemical Warfare Service, Medical Department, Corps of Engineers, Coast Artillery Corps.

[33] See War Department Supply Circular No. 88, p. 14.

[34] On October 14, 1918, the board of governors of the American Cotton Manufacturers' Association, the organization of cotton textile manufacturers of the South, unanimously adopted the following resolution which they sent to the proper authorities in Washington, urging the elimination of the clause which had been inserted:

Whereas it has been brought to the attention of the board of governors of the American Cotton Manufacturers' Association that southern mills have recently felt compelled to decline Government contracts because of the insertion of a restrictive clause that would prohibit the working of young people between the ages of 14 and 16 years more than eight hours a day; and

(Footnotes continued on page 138.)

Although an order directing the insertion of the clause in all contracts made by the Navy Department which required the employment of laborers and mechanics in the fulfillment thereof was reported to the War Labor Policies Board in October, the clause had not been generally found in contracts placed by the various bureaus of the Navy Department up to April, when inspections by the Child-Labor Division were discontinued.

The Emergency Fleet Corporation of the United States Shipping Board was the third largest governmental purchasing agency operating during the war. In July, 1918, 149 shipyards employing an average of 248,543 persons were building merchant ships for the corporation. In addition to contracts for work performed in shipyards, contracts were placed by the corporation for the construction of shipbuilding plants, for the construction of dwellings to house the shipyard workers, for building materials, and for equipment for the completed ships. Although it was originally the intention of the Industrial Relations Division of the Emergency Fleet Corporation to have the child-labor provisions made a part of all classes of contracts and subcontracts, no definite action toward this end had been taken at the time of the armistice. It was then decided that in view of the probability of the early discontinuance of the governmental shipbuilding program, the labor clauses agreed upon by the War Labor Policies Board should not be inserted in any of the contract forms of the Emergency Fleet Corporation, but that the following clause already included in almost all the contracts let by the board should henceforth be universally used:

> The contractor will comply with all instructions as to wages and conditions of employment of labor on this contract given to him in writing by the owner. If, by reason of any such instructions, the cost of articles shall be increased or decreased, then the sum to be paid by the owner to the contractor shall be increased or decreased by such amounts.

While the authority given through this provision was undoubtedly broad enough to cover all conditions of employment, it was obviously

---

Whereas the acceptance of such contracts with this restrictive clause inserted would be contrary to the spirit of the Supreme Court decision in the recently declared United States child-labor case, which recognized the rights of the State to control in such matters; and

Whereas their acceptance with this restriction would further curtail production of essential war material at a time when labor is so scarce, due to the draft and the requirements of the Government in other lines of effort, such as the operation of the railroads, the shipbuilding industry, etc.; and

Whereas it would be unfair to mills on Government work since mills on civilian business would not be affected thereby which would result in a shifting of help from one class of mills to the other; and

Whereas the operation of such clause would have the further effect of reducing the output on civilian orders also, it being impractical to most mills to separate the labor working part on Government and part on civilian orders: Wherefore, be it

Resolved, That the board of governors of the American Cotton Manufacturers' Association can not see its way clear to advise its members to rescind their action in declining contracts with these objectionable clauses inserted. We feel that no industry has rallied to the Government more loyally in the great task in hand, having cut off civilian orders to give the Government business preference, having changed over our mills so as to do Government work, having aided the Government in every possible way to obtain the goods it desired in maximum quantities at minimum prices, having voluntarily accepted price fixing and aided in same, and having responded generously to each financial call of every character whatsoever. No lack of patriotism can therefore justly be attributed to mills for their action.

inadequate as a substitute for the clauses recommended by the War Labor Policies Board unless accompanied or followed by instructions "in writing" embodying specifically the terms of these clauses. Unfortunately, no such instructions were generally issued with reference to the restriction of child labor or the maintenance of State standards, even in the case of shipyards which were owned by the Government itself. Had such instructions been given at the outset and the attention of the contractors called to the necessity of exercising care in the observance of prewar standards, it is probable that fewer violations of the State and Federal laws would have been found by the inspectors of the Child-Labor Division in shipbuilding plants.

The striking laxity in the observance of both State and Federal child-labor standards found in the canneries inspected by the Child-Labor Division in the summer of 1918[35] showed the special need for effective Federal regulation in the food-canning industry. Although a large part of the canned goods produced in the United States during 1918 was purchased by the Government for the use of the Army and Navy, it was not manufactured in fulfillment of contracts made by the War and Navy Departments. In consequence, it was not possible for these departments to regulate labor conditions in the canneries through their contracting powers. However, under the law creating the Food Administration, this body was given certain regulatory powers over all food-producing concerns, including the power to commandeer any part of the product of these concerns which it deemed essential for war purposes. The Food Administration was represented on the War Labor Policies Board, and it was hoped by the chairman of the board that provisions for the regulation of labor conditions might legitimately be inserted in licenses issued by the Food Administration, as in contracts made by the War and Navy Departments and other direct purchasing agencies of the Government. The executive heads of the Food Administration, however, were unwilling to take this step, since they were of the opinion that it was doubtful whether the purposes for which the administration was created could properly be extended to include the regulation of labor conditions in licensed food concerns. Therefore, although practically every large canning concern in the country was packing goods intended for Government consumption, during the 10 months between June 3, 1918, when the Federal child-labor law of 1916 was declared unconstitutional, and April 25, 1919, when the child-labor-tax law went into effect, there was no Federal child-labor regulation which applied to canneries.

While the child-labor clause was thus regularly incorporated in the contract forms of only two of the Government departments, it should

[35] See pp. 95-105, 130-132.

be remembered that one of these, the War Department, was the purchaser of the great bulk of the goods bought by the Government for war purposes. Moreover, through the contracts placed by the War Department alone, almost all the principal child-employing industries were reached. Shipbuilding and the canning of food products were the only industries in which any considerable number of children were employed which were not in the market for War Department contracts.

Pending the introduction of the clause into the contract forms of the various purchasing departments, a special inquiry into the effect of the war upon the employment of children in selected industrial centers was made by inspectors of the division. This inquiry revealed an alarming increase in the numbers of children employed in practically all the industries and localities in which war production had been undertaken on an extensive scale. It was therefore decided that although definite information regarding the plants awarded contracts containing the child-labor clause was not yet available inspections should be commenced at once in selected localities and industries in which it was known that large numbers of Government orders had been placed. Inspections were accordingly commenced in October in the textile and metal goods industries of Connecticut, one of the States in which war production had been most extensive. A special discussion of the conditions disclosed by the Connecticut inspections is to be found in a later section of this report.[36]

As information regarding the plants awarded contracts containing the child-labor clause was reported to the division, inspections were extended to other States. Because of the fact that the clause was not inserted in the contract forms of any of the larger purchasing bureaus until little more than a month before the signing of the armistice and the subsequent general reduction in war orders, the number of plants reported as actually working under the child-labor provision was relatively small.

In all, 324 plants exclusive of shipyards were inspected with a view to the enforcement of the child-labor contract clause in the following States: Connecticut, Illinois, Indiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Vermont, and Wisconsin. In addition, a number of concerns working on war orders were covered in the joint inspections made with the State labor departments in New York and Kentucky. A few plants awarded contracts containing the child-labor clause were reported from other States, but their number was too small to warrant the expense of inspection. No reports were received of contracts let to child-employing industries in the Southern States during the time

[36] See pp. 142–150.

in which the clause was in effect, with the exception of one group of textile mills in Alabama and a few clothing concerns in Georgia.

Three-fourths (243) of the 324 plants inspected under the child-labor contract clause were located in the four States of Connecticut, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and New Jersey, and the following brief discussion of the conditions found in three of these States may be regarded as typical of conditions in all the States in which these inspections were made. A common characteristic of these States was that their State minimum-age standards were the same as the Federal. On the other hand, in six States—Connecticut, Indiana, Maryland, New Hampshire, Pennsylvania, and Vermont—the State hour standards were lower than the Federal. The test of the effectiveness of the contract clause as a method of regulating conditions of labor was therefore to be found in the observance of the Federal hour standards by plants operating in these six States. A first inspection, however, could hardly be considered a fair test, especially since many of the inspections were made in the period of industrial reorganization following the armistice; and it was unfortunately not possible, prior to the operation of the new Federal child-labor-tax law, to make second inspections of plants in which violations of the contract clause were found and reported to the contracting Government agency.

Since the clause relating to child labor and the enforcement of State laws had not been inserted in shipbuilding contracts by either the Navy Department or the Emergency Fleet Corporation, no shipyards had been reported to the Child-Labor Division for inspection. However, shortly after the inspections of plants working on contracts containing the child-labor clause were commenced, a number of complaints were received by the Children's Bureau regarding the illegal employment of children in shipbuilding plants. In consequence of these complaints, a special investigation of child-labor conditions in that industry was undertaken by the division in the winter of 1918 and the spring of 1919. Inspections were made of 110 establishments in 23 States, including practically all the shipbuilding plants on the Atlantic Coast, the Gulf of Mexico, and the Great Lakes, and reported as employing together almost 300,000 persons. This inquiry (see Table K) showed not only a considerably greater number of violations of State and Federal regulations than was found in the inspections of other manufacturing establishments, but also a serious tendency toward the employment of young children in occupations which because of their hazard are in many States prohibited for minors under 16 or, in some cases, for all minors under 18. In all, 1,618 children under 16 were found at work by the Federal inspectors, 143 of whom were under 14 years of age, and 137 of whom were working more than eight hours a day. The

number of children employed in hazardous occupations prohibited by State law or ruling was 447, or over one-fourth of the total number of children under 16 found at work. A special study of the hazards to which children were found exposed in the shipbuilding industry was made by the division in connection with these inspections, the findings of which are shortly to be published in a separate report.

Connecticut.

Connecticut was selected as the State in which special inspections of plants engaged in war production should be commenced for two reasons. In the first place, pending definite information regarding the placing of contracts containing the clause restricting child labor, it was necessary to confine the inspection to well-known war production areas. Connecticut was known to be a State in which large amounts of war materials were produced. In the second place, in order to ascertain how the child-labor clause was actually complied with in plants engaged upon contracts in which the provision had been placed, it was believed advisable to commence inspection in States where the State standards were lower than the Federal.

The child-labor law of Connecticut established the same age minimum for factory employment—14 years—as the former Federal child-labor law and the war contract clause. In addition, the State law prohibited the employment of minors under 16 in certain hazardous processes and occupations, and of minors under 18 in certain other occupations. The State hour standards, however, were distinctly lower than those fixed by Federal regulation. While night work was prohibited by State law for children under 16, they might be employed for 10 hours a day and 55 hours a week.

Children between 14 and 16 were required to secure an employment certificate before they could be legally employed in any mechanical, mercantile, or manufacturing establishment. In order to qualify for a certificate, the child had to satisfy the issuing officer that he was at least 14 years of age, that he did not "appear to be physically unfit for employment," and that he was "able to read with facility, to write legibly simple sentences, and to perform the operations of the fundamental rules of arithmetic with relation both to whole numbers and to fractions." In actual practice the latter requirement was regarded as equivalent to the completion of at least the fifth grade. A certificate permitting work during the summer vacation might, however, be secured without fulfillment of this educational requirement. The law did not specify what kind of proof of age should be required of applicants for certificates.

The Connecticut law differed from the child-labor laws of other States in two important administrative provisions: First, it was the only State that provided for the issuance of all employment certificates

by one central authority, the State board of education;[37] second, it was the only State in which the enforcement of the laws relating to minimum age and employment certificates and those relating to hours of labor and dangerous trades were intrusted to entirely separate agencies.

In addition to issuing employment certificates throughout the State, the agents of the State board of education inspected establishments for violations of the minimum age and certificate law and also directed and supplemented the work of the local truant officers in the enforcement of the school-attendance law. Inspectors of the department of labor and factory inspection, on the other hand, made inspections for the purpose of seeing that the laws relating to the hours of labor and dangerous occupations were observed. After the Federal child-labor law of 1916 became operative, both the commissioner of labor and factory inspection and the secretary of the State board of education were commissioned by the Secretary of Labor to assist in the enforcement of the Federal law. Acting under this authority, agents of the State board of education during the time the law was in operation inspected for violations of the Federal law regarding hours of labor, as well as for violations of the State and Federal minimum age requirements.

Shortly after the entrance of the United States into the war, the Connecticut legislature passed an act authorizing the governor, upon request of the Council of National Defense, to suspend or modify any of the State labor laws for definite periods during the war "when essential to national defense." However, no suspensions or modifications of the State laws were made under the authority of this act with regard to the employment of children.

Plans for the Connecticut inspections were made after consultation with the State board of education and the State factory inspection department, the two bodies intrusted with the enforcement of the State child-labor laws, and the Federal inspectors in their work had the cooperation of the agents and inspectors of these departments. A few joint inspections were made with agents of the State board of education in connection with the study of the certificating system. Violations of the State employment-certificate law found by the Federal inspectors were reported to the agents of the State board of education, who brought a number of prosecutions in the State courts on the basis of this information.

Inspections were commenced in Connecticut in the second week of November, 1918, and were continued into January, 1919. Additional inspections of plants later reported as having incomplete or

[37] In Wisconsin and Oregon, certificates must be issued by a central authority (in Wisconsin the industrial commission, and in Oregon the board of inspectors of child labor) or some person designated by it, but the persons designated are not in all cases paid agents of the central authority.

"open" contracts containing the child-labor clause were made in March and April.

The total number of manufacturing establishments inspected in Connecticut was 116, located in 30 cities and towns. In selecting plants for inspection, emphasis was placed chiefly upon industries reported or likely to be engaged either directly or indirectly in war production. Inspections were made also of a number of establishments reported by the State authorities as employing an unusually large number of children, or as being unusually negligent in their observance of the State law. The majority of the plants inspected were engaged in the manufacture or finishing of textile goods, including 20 woolen and worsted mills, 17 cotton mills, 13 silk mills, 3 hosiery and knit goods mills, 1 dyeing and finishing plant, and 1 mill in which cordage was manufactured, making a total of 55 establishments. The second largest group of establishments inspected, consisting of 36 shops and factories, manufactured various kinds of metal goods, including foundry and machine shop products, tools and gauges, chains and accessories, firearms, screws, locks, and other hardware, typewriters, electrical fixtures, clocks and watches, buttons, hooks and eyes, and metal novelties of various kinds. A number of these establishments had turned over all or part of their equipment to the manufacture of munitions or army equipment. In addition, inspections were made in 7 paper-box factories, 4 clothing shops, 2 plants engaged in the manufacture of hats, 3 concerns making rubber goods, 1 printing plant, 1 bookbinding, 1 corset, and 1 soap factory, 2 concerns manufacturing leather goods, and 3 shipbuilding plants.

Of the 116 establishments inspected, 17 only were found to have had no Government work during the period of the war. These were practically all small plants, the majority of which produced articles adapted chiefly for civilian needs. Thirty-one concerns, most of which were inspected some time after the signing of the armistice, reported that they had previously been engaged either directly or indirectly on Government work, but that their orders had been completed or canceled before the time of the inspection. The remaining 68 were found to be engaged in war production at the time of inspection. Four of these were merely filling purchase orders, and 18 were not working directly for the Government but were producing goods for sale to other manufacturers for use in filling their war orders; so that only 46 of the establishments inspected were engaged directly in filling Government contracts. Over one-half (27) of these concerns were found to be working on Navy Department or Shipping Board contracts, which contained no clause relating to the restriction of child labor, or on contracts placed by various bureaus of the War Department before the date of the insertion of this clause in the contract forms used by these bureaus. All contracts with the Quar-

termasters Corps of the War Department signed after September 20, and all Ordnance contracts signed after October 15, in fulfillment of which work was being done by 18 firms at the time of inspection, were found to contain the clause restricting the employment of child labor. Three other concerns were working on contracts containing a clause prohibiting the employment of all children under 16 years of age.

It was found that in most of the plants working on Government goods the provisions of the child-labor contract clause were generally unknown or disregarded, and children were employed in the filling of war orders in violation of the hour standards imposed by the contract. In the majority of cases the persons in direct charge of the plant claimed to be entirely ignorant that their contract contained any restrictions relating to labor. Even the representatives of the War Department, who were on duty in some of these plants for the purpose of seeing that the conditions of the contracts were fulfilled, stated they had not been aware of the existence of the labor clauses. In the majority of these cases the ignorance on the part of the local management was due to lack of instructions from headquarters; the actual contracts were kept in the main offices, which were located in other cities, and only the production specifications were furnished to the local management. In several other instances work was being done in the fulfillment of contracts which had not been signed, or at any rate not received from the contracting department. In one plant all the children under 16 were employed in the office, and the manager believed that since they were not engaged directly in the manufacture of Government goods they were exempt from the regulations imposed in the contract. The manager of one plant, who admitted that children were employed in his plant in the manufacture of Government goods in violation of the terms of the contract, justified his action by stating that he and other manufacturers had been advised by counsel that since one department of the Federal Government (the Supreme Court) had found the standards of the former child-labor law unconstitutional, no other branch of the Government could legally insist on the observance of the same standards.

The great expansion of Connecticut industries due to war production, which began soon after the declaration of war in 1914 through the placing of orders by agents of the allied Governments with the various munition plants of the State, was early accompanied by a marked increase in the employment of child labor. The records of the State board of education relative to the issuance of employment certificates, which are summarized in Table XI, show that the number of children under 16 years of age entering employment on regular certificates each year more than doubled in the period between August 1, 1914, and July 31, 1918. There was, moreover, a considerably

greater increase in the numbers going to work on vacation permits, indicating that had it not been for the educational qualifications required in applicants for a regular certificate the increase in the number of children permanently leaving school for work would have been much larger.

TABLE XI.—*Employment certificates issued to children in Connecticut from Aug. 1, 1913, to July 31, 1918, classified by year of issue and type of certificate.* [1]

Type of certificate.	Certificates issued to children								
						Per cent increase.[2]			
	1913–14	1914–15	1915–16	1916–17	1917–18	1914–15 over 1913–14	1915–16 over 1914–15	1916–17 over 1915–16	1917–18 over 1916–17
Regular certificate..	6,307	6,862	11,938	11,502	13,699	8.8	74.0	−3.7	19.1
Vacation certificate.	658	1,043	2,899	3,224	4,033	58.5	177.9	11.2	25.1
Copies of certificate (subsequent).....	6,312	5,379	12,762	16,404	17,756	−14.8	137.3	28.5	8.2

[1] Compiled from unpublished figures furnished by Connecticut State Board of Education.
[2] A minus sign (−) denotes decrease.

In spite of the greatly increased demand for child labor due to war production, there appears to have been no tendency toward an increase in the illegal employment of children through a relaxation of administrative standards on the part of the State officials. As shown by Table XII, not a single child under 14 years of age was found at work by the Federal inspectors in any of the 116 plants inspected in Connecticut, which together employed a total of some 70,000 persons. No children were found working at night, and only 5 of the 2,079 minors between 14 and 16 years of age employed in these plants were found to work over 10 hours a day, in violation of the State laws. It must be remembered, however, that the greater number of the inspections of the Connecticut plants were made after the signing of the armistice, in consequence of which many war orders had been canceled and there had been a general slackening up of production and reduction of overtime employment.

Children between 14 and 16 years of age were found employed in 105 of the 116 plants inspected, representing practically all the industries in which inspections were made. The 2,079 minors under 16 found at work in these 105 plants were almost half as many as the total number of that age reported in the State as employed in 2,598 manufacturing establishments in the census of 1914,[38] showing that in all probability the number of children legally employed, even after the reduction or cancellation of war orders, was even greater than before the war.

[38] Abstract of the census of manufactures, 1914, pp. 564 565, Washington, 1917.

TABLE XII.—*Number of mills and factories inspected in Connecticut after June 3, 1918, and number of children employed in violation of Federal and State age and hour standards.*

Industry	Mills and factories inspected.	Number of children employed in violation of Federal and State age and hour standards.			
		Age.		Hour	
		Federal.	State.	Federal	State.
Total	116	.....	.....	1,936	
Total, exclusive of shipbuilding	113	.....	.....	1,936	
Woolen and worsted goods	20	.....	.....	136	
Cotton goods	17	.....	.....	331	1
Silk goods	13	.....	.....	92	1
Hosiery and knit goods	3	.....	.....	51	.....
Other textile goods [1]	2	.....	.....	28	.....
Clothing	4	.....	.....	23	.....
Foundry and machine-shop products	6	.....	.....	12	.....
Brass, bronze, and copper products	6	.....	.....	206	.....
Hardware	4	.....	.....	205	.....
Clocks and watches	4	.....	.....	249	.....
Tools	3	.....	.....	29	.....
Typewriters	3	.....	.....	162	.....
Other metal goods	10	.....	.....	131	.....
Paper boxes	7	.....	.....	32	.....
Rubber goods	3	.....	.....	152	.....
All other industries [2]	8	.....	.....	87	.....
Shipbuilding	3	.....	.....	.....	.....
Steel ships	1	.....	.....	.....	.....
Wooden ships	2	.....	.....	.....	.....

[1] Other textile goods embrace: Cordage, 1 establishment; dyeing and finishing textiles, 1 establishment.
[2] All other industries embrace: Leather goods, 2 establishments; soap, 1 establishment; bookbinding, 1 establishment; printing, 1 establishment; corsets, 1 establishment; hats, 2 establishments.

Almost one-half (1,016) of the children between 14 and 16 years of age found at work in the plants inspected (exclusive of shipyards) were employed in the metal trades. Of these the largest number were engaged in the manufacture of clocks and watches, brass, bronze, and copper products, hardware, and typewriters. Children were employed in these industries in a large number of minutely subdivided occupations, most of them relatively unskilled and involving work of a purely mechanical nature. The majority were engaged in light bench work, such as the assembling, counting, sorting, stringing up, and fitting of small parts; in inspecting and packing; and in office and errand work. Other occupations in which children were found include the operation of drills and other foot and power presses, and milling machines; japanning, lacquering, and also serving as machinists' and toolmakers' apprentices. A few children under 16 were found working in occupations prohibited by State law, such as soldering, and operating stamping machines. Children were also found in some instances working at dangerous or unpleasant processes, or in undesirable places not specifically prohibited by State law; as, for example, in the lacquering and japanning departments, where the workers are exposed to disagreeable and irritating

fumes. While only a few children were engaged in the actual work of japanning and lacquering, a much larger number were employed in the same rooms in stringing up the parts preparatory to their being dipped in the lacquer. In addition to the children engaged in the metal trades, 37 of the 58 boys under 16 found at work in the Connecticut shipyards were employed in metal-working occupations. The majority of these were employed in occupations in which they were, or might be at any time, required to work on scaffolding in violation of the State law.

About one-third (657) of the total number of children under 16 found at work in Connecticut were employed in the textile industries, chiefly in the manufacture of cotton goods. These children were engaged in the usual occupations of minors between 14 and 16 employed in such industries.

In the rubber-goods establishments, the majority of the children were employed in making and fitting up different parts of shoes and boots, which are the chief products of these factories in Connecticut. A smaller number were engaged in laying out work, stitching, carrying odd stock, cementing linings, cutting, sorting, and serving as spreaders, varnishers, heaters, and calendar machine helpers.

The leading occupations in which children were engaged in the manufacture of corsets were clasping, clipping threads, metal working, and inspecting.

In the making of paper boxes, children were found employed mainly at light unskilled work, such as turning in the edges of the paper "strips," fitting covers, pasting on labels and trimming, packing, piling covers, tying up, stacking, carrying, and running errands. A few were employed at stripping—that is, operating a simple machine which covers the sides and ends of the box with strips of paper. One child was found operating a corner-cutting and one a corner-staying machine, both dangerous machines unless adequately guarded.

Judging from information obtained from State officials and employers, the 8-hour day for minors under 16 had been generally observed in Connecticut while the Federal child-labor law was in operation. In some plants all minors under 16 had been dismissed, while in others the hours of work for such minors had been reduced to conform to the Federal standards. But as soon as the Federal law was declared unconstitutional, the old schedule was resumed, and children were found to be working regularly from 8½ hours to 10 hours a day in the majority of the establishments inspected. An 8-hour day for minors was found to be in operation in nine plants—in three of them because the employer was under the impression that it was required by State law. In one other plant the few children employed directly in the manufacture of Government goods were on an 8-hour schedule,

although this concern did not have any contract with the Government which contained the clause restricting the hours of labor of children. The usual schedule of work was 10 hours on the first five days of the week, and 5 hours on Saturday, making a total of 55 hours a week, the maximum permitted by State law. Though satisfactory time records showing the actual hours of commencing and stopping work, and the time off for lunch each day, were kept in only about a third of the establishments inspected, evidence was secured showing that 5 children employed in 4 textile mills had worked more than 55 hours during the week immediately preceding the inspection, and that some dozen children were regularly employed between the hours of 6 and 7 p. m. in violation of the State law. It should be stated that in all the plants in which overtime violations were found the regular schedule of hours conformed with the State regulations, and the violations found were occasional rather than customary.

Certificates were not found on file for 63 children between 14 and 16 employed in 34 factories, nor for 17 children in 2 of the 3 shipyards inspected. All these children were, however, of legal working age, and a number of them had been certificated for work in some previous job but had failed to apply for a new certificate on entering the employment at which the inspectors found them at work. A few were working on Rhode Island certificates, owing to the fact that their employer believed these certificates fulfilled the requirements of the Connecticut law. In several cases employers maintained that the certificate had been mislaid, and their statements were supported by the records of the issuing office, which showed that certificates had previously been issued to the children in question.

In consequence of the centralization of the administration of the employment-certificate system in one State agency the method of issuing certificates and the enforcement of the certificate law in mills and factories were substantially uniform throughout the State. In general employers were found to be well informed about the requirements of the certificate law and desirous of living up to it. When children were found by the Federal inspectors to be working without certificates they were in almost every case sent immediately by their employers to the issuing officer to be certificated. The only establishment inspected in which more than 5 children were found to be working without certificates was a shipbuilding plant where 17 were found; this plant had taken on a greatly increased number of minor employees during the preceding year. The plant was inspected at the request of the agent of the State board of education of that district, who, on the basis of the findings of the Federal inspectors, brought suit against the owners and caused them to be fined in court for violation of the Connecticut certificate law.

Although the law did not specify the kind of evidence to be accepted as proof of age the State board of education required that birth or baptismal records be secured in preference to other evidence. Connecticut is one of the States which have had for some years an effectively administered birth-registration law, so that it is possible to secure a town clerk's certificate of age for almost all children under 16 who have been born in the State. In the case of foreign-born children passports or immigration records were accepted, and before the war children who could not furnish such documentary evidence were obliged to wait for their certificates until they could obtain a birth record from their native country. The proof of age demanded, therefore, conformed with the Federal requirements, except that a parent's affidavit might be accepted when satisfactory documentary evidence was lacking. In actual practice, as the Connecticut law was administered, this fact was not of serious importance, since out of the total number of State certificates examined in connection with the Federal inspections less than 2 per cent were found to be issued on parent's affidavit unsupported by other proof of age. That an effort was made by the State authorities to secure the best kind of evidence is shown by the fact that 95 per cent of the certificates examined were found to have been issued on documentary proof prescribed by the Federal regulations.

Birth certificates had been furnished as evidence in almost three-fourths of the total number of cases investigated by the Federal inspectors. Such evidence was not, however, found to be uniformly reliable, since the birth-registration law of Connecticut does not prohibit a parent from registering the birth of his child at any time merely by making affidavit of the child's birth date before a registrar of births. A child's birth may thus be registered only a few hours before he applies for his employment certificate. Since in a number of towns no documentary evidence is required by the town clerk in registering the birth in corroboration of the statement of the parent, it is believed by the State authorities that a record of age made under such conditions is of little value. Moreover, the date of registration is not given on the transcript of the birth record furnished the issuing officer, so that it is impossible for him to tell how valuable such a record may be as proof of age. A number of such abuses of the birth-registration law were found by the Federal inspectors or reported to them by agents of the State board of education.

New Hampshire.

Inspections were made in New Hampshire in February, March, and April of 1919. In all, 74 plants were visited, located in 26 cities and towns. They included 50 textile mills, 11 shoe factories, 2 clothing factories, 2 shipyards, and 9 miscellaneous manufacturing concerns. Although the greater number of these concerns had previously

worked on war orders, only 8 were actually found to be manufacturing Government goods at the time of the inspection.

The minimum age for employment in mills, factories, stores, and offices fixed by the New Hampshire child-labor law was the same as that required by the Federal regulations. Minors under 18 could not work for more than 54 hours a week or 10¼ hours a day,[39] or before 6.30 a. m. or after 7 p. m. Employment certificates issued by the local school officials were required for children between 14 and 16 years of age. No special restrictions regarding the employment of children in hazardous trades were contained in the State law.

New Hampshire was unique in that all the provisions of its child-labor law were administered by educational authorities. Inspections were made by inspectors of the State department of education for violation not only of the age and certificate law, as in Connecticut, but also of the law regarding hours of labor. The New Hampshire system differed further from that of Connecticut in that certificates were issued by local school authorities, and local truant officers were required to cooperate through visits and inspections in the enforcement of the law in their respective districts. Inspectors of the State department of labor cooperated by reporting suspected violations of the law to the State educational authorities.

TABLE XIII.—*Number of mills and factories inspected in New Hampshire after June 3, 1918, and number of children employed in violation of Federal and State age and hour standards, by industry.*

Industry.	Mills and factories inspected.	Children employed in violation of Federal and State age and hour standards.			
		Age.		Hour.	
		Federal.	State.	Federal.	State.
Total	74	3	3	74	.....
Total exclusive of shipbuilding	72	2	2	74	.....
Woolen and worsted goods	16	.....	.....	13	.....
Hoisery and knit goods	16	.....	.....	18	.....
Cotton goods	15	2	2	31	.....
Other textiles [a]	3	.....	.....	1	.....
Boots and shoes	11	.....	.....	9	.....
Clothing	2	.....	.....	.....	.....
All other industries [b]	9	.....	.....	2	.....
Shipbuilding	2	1	1	.....	.....
Steel ships	1	1	1	.....	.....
Wooden ships	1	.....	.....	.....	.....

[a] Other textiles embrace: Linen goods, 1 establishment; silk goods, 1 establishment; dyeing and finishing textiles, 1 establishment.

[b] All other industries embrace: Needles, hooks and eyes, 2 establishments; paper goods, 1 establishment; electrical supplies, 1 establishment; toys, 1 establishment; leather goods, 1 establishment; optical goods 1 establishment; boot and shoe findings, 1 establishment; book binding, 1 establishment

[39] The act does not apply to labor performed entirely in the manufacture of munitions or supplies for the United States Government or for the government of the State of New Hampshire, while the United States is at war with any other nation. There are other exemptions not applying to factories

New Hampshire was one of the States in which the employment of children was greatly increased through the pressure of war production.[40] The Federal inspections were not commenced until three months after the signing of the armistice, when practically all war orders had been completed or canceled, and all inspections were made during the months when the schools were in session. Yet the number of children under 16 (541) found at work in the 74 plants inspected was greater than the total number of children under that age reported in 1914 as employed in all the manufacturing industries of the State combined.[41]

That this increase in the number of working children was not due to any extent to the entrance into industry of children under legal working age was shown by the fact that only three children under 14 were found at work in the plants visited by the Federal inspectors. One of these, a boy of 13, was employed as cleaner and passer in a shipyard, where he had given his age as 16 when he applied for work. The other two, 13 and 11 years old, were employed as spooler and weaver, respectively, in a small tape mill operated by foreigners, in which a number of violations of the certificate law were also found. These two children had claimed to be 16 or over when they applied for work, as they did also when questioned by the Federal inspectors.

No violations of the State hour and night work regulations were found. The general tendency in the plants inspected was to work the entire force, both adult and minor, considerably shorter hours than the maximum prescribed by law. In 16 concerns a 48-hour week had been established for all employees, the working-day being 8 hours and 40 minutes. Of the 541 children under 16 found at work only 74 were employed for more than 8 hours a day. Of these 74 children only 1 was found in a plant working on war orders, although at the time of the inspections such establishments were employing 181 children. No violation of the contract provisions was being made in the case of the factory employing this child, however, since it was engaged on a contract placed in May, 1918. The working-day for minors was 8 hours or less in 17 of the 46 concerns in which children were found at work. In a few establishments children had not been put back on the full-time schedule when the former Federal law was declared unconstitutional—in one case because of ignorance of the Supreme Court decision.

A large number of the children found at work for less than the 8-hour day were employed as part-time workers. Although a child under 16 was required to remain in school until he had completed the

[40] See Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, being the Fifty-ninth Report upon the Public Schools of New Hampshire, 1915–16, pp. 26–28, and Annual Reports of the School Committee of the City of Manchester, N. H., for the year ending Dec. 31, 1915 et seq.], prepared by the Superintendent of Public Instruction.

[41] See Abstract of the Census of Manufactures, 1914, pp. 564–565. Washington, 1917.

eighth grade unless excused on recommendation of the State superintendent of public instruction, the law did not specify that he could not work before or after school hours, on Saturdays, or during vacation. In actual practice the educational qualifications required for a certificate were variously interpreted in different localities. In a few towns no certificates were granted for work during the months when the schools were in session except to children who had completed the eighth grade. In Manchester only children who had reached the sixth grade were permitted to work out of school hours.[42] In most towns, however, special permits to work before and after school and on Saturdays were issued to children who had reached the age of 14, regardless of the amount of schooling they had had. Children were found working on special certificates of this kind in about one-fourth of the plants inspected. Those who were employed both before and after school usually began work at 7 or 7.30 a. m.—sometimes even earlier—worked until 8 or 8.30 a. m., attended school during the full session of 5 hours, and then returned to work from 3 or 4 to 6 p. m., making a day of practically uninterrupted work and schooling of at least 10 or 11 hours. In Manchester and Nashua[43] a system of part-time work was in effect. In these cities special classes had been arranged so that children might work half the day and attend school the other half. The mills and factories in these cities cooperated in employing the children on two shifts, half of them going to school for 4 hours of intensive study in the morning and working for 4 hours in the afternoon, and the other half working for 4 or 5 hours in the morning and going to school in the afternoon.

The proportion of children found at work without certificates in New Hampshire was relatively small—29, or 5 per cent of the total of 541 employed. The certificate law was generally found to be well administered, and with somewhat greater uniformity than in other States where the issuance of certificates is in the hands of local officials. This doubtless was due largely to the careful supervision given the work of the local officials by the State authorities. Forms and methods of issuing and filing data relating to certificates were prescribed by the State superintendent of public instruction. Inspectors of the State educational department not only visited the local issuing offices to examine the records and pass upon all proof of age accepted, but they also inspected from two to four times a year all the establishments in the State in which children were employed. Thus they were able to check up on the administration of the certificate law from the factory as well as the office end.

[42] Annual Report of the School Committee of the City of Manchester, N. H., for the year ending Dec. 31, 1917, prepared by the Superintendent of Public Instruction, p. 8.

[43] The Nashua condition was temporary, due to the burning of one school building and consequent crowding resulting in the lower grades attending school during the morning session and the higher grades during the afternoon session.

The New Hampshire law provided that proof of age must be furnished by a record of birth or baptism, a passport, or some other public record. In general, certificates were found to have been issued on evidence acceptable under the Federal regulations, although the State superintendent of public instruction had ruled that school records or school census records might be accepted as "other records" where no other proof was available.

Birth records were furnished as proof of age by the greater number of children born in New Hampshire. Where a child has not been registered at birth, however, many town clerks as in other States are willing to enter the record of his birth at any time merely on the oath of the parent. These late birth registrations were found to be comparatively numerous. Superintendents had been empowered by the State authorities to refuse such records where they were discovered; but, since the birth certificate does not bear the date of registration, the superintendent could not know without a personal search for each child's records which were recent and which were original entries. Baptismal records were available for practically all Catholic children, and these were very generally accepted as evidence of age in the case of French-Canadian children born in Canada for whom no birth records were available. Baptismal records were usually found to be good, although a few cases of forged records, upon which employment certificates had been issued, were discovered by the Federal inspectors. In some towns it was found that school census records were relied upon even when other evidence could have been secured.

The unreliability of certain kinds of documentary evidence usually considered satisfactory, and the difficulty of determining the actual age of a child in the absence of contemporaneous birth records, were illustrated by the case of one child whose evidence presented bewildering contradictions. When asked for proof that she was 16 years old, as she had claimed, the child produced a statement written in Greek and purporting to have been signed by the mayor of the city in Greece in which she had lived prior to coming to America. According to this document she was 15 years old in May, 1916, which would have made her 17 or 18 years old at the time of the inspection, rather than 16, as she had claimed. A passport, however, also dated May, 1916, stated that she was then 10 years old, making her less than 13 when the inspection was made. When pressed for an explanation, the father declared that the child's age had been lowered in order to get her in at half fare. It is well known that the ages of children are frequently falsified on passports for the purpose of getting cheaper transportation rates to America; but, on the other hand, fraudulent statements of the kind presented by this child are reported to be manufactured in considerable numbers in Manchester and other New Hampshire cities and sold to Greek

children or their parents for $5 each. In this case it was impossible to tell whether the mayor's statement was fraudulent or the age on the passport falsified, or whether both records were incorrect.

New Jersey.

The age-and-hour standards established by the New Jersey child-labor law were practically the same as those of the Federal law and the child-labor contract clause, and the evidence of age acceptable for certificates under the New Jersey law met the requirements of the Federal regulations. In addition, the State law provided that children under 16 could not obtain working permits until they had completed the work of the fifth grade in school. It further prohibited altogether the employment of any minor under 16 in certain specified occupations or processes, and in any trade or process as should cause "such exposure to excessive heat, cold, muscular exertion, or other physical risk as shall, in the judgment of the commissioner of labor, be harmful to the health and future working efficiency of such minor."

Shortly after the Federal child-labor act became effective (September, 1917) inspections were made in 12 glass factories and 2 canneries located in the southern part of New Jersey. No children under 16 were found at work in the canneries. In the glass factories 99 boys under 16 were employed. They were working as snappers-up, carriers-in, and machine tenders, and also as packers, water boys, spare hands, and office boys. One of these children was under 14, 1 was working at night, and 25 were employed in violation of the Federal hour standards. In addition 37, or over one-third of the total number, were working without certificates in violation of the State law.

Further inspections were made in New Jersey in February, March, and April, 1919, chiefly of establishments engaged in war work. New Jersey was one of the States in which there had been the most marked industrial expansion due to war production. As in Connecticut, this expansion was early accompanied by a noticeable increase in the employment of children. The scarcity of adult labor caused manufacturers, even those who had never before hired children, to employ them in considerable numbers.[14] The increasing demand for child labor in industries and occupations hitherto open only to older persons, and the high wages offered, attracted large numbers into industrial life who under normal conditions would have remained in school. In Newark, for instance, the largest industrial city in the State, the number of children taking out employment certificates increased in 1915–16 41.9 per cent over the preceding year. In Jersey City the number of children certificated was between three and

[14] State of New Jersey. Report of the Department of Labor for the year 1917, p. 83.

four times as great in 1917–18 as in the year following the outbreak of the European war. While in most cities the greatest increase in the employment of children took place in the earlier years of the war, the number leaving school for work continued to grow each year; and in practically all the centers of war production there was a corresponding decline in school enrollment, chiefly in the upper elementary and high-school grades. This was especially noticeable in Trenton, which, situated within easy distance of a number of shipyards, munition works, and other war factories, supplied child labor not only for its own industries, but also for those of neighboring communities. Almost 600 fewer children were enrolled in the seventh, eighth, and ninth grades of the Trenton public schools in the autumn of 1918 than in the preceding year.[45]

In the inspections of February, March, and April, 1919, 36 plants were visited; these were located in 18 cities and towns scattered throughout practically every part of the State. Inspections were made of 19 establishments reported by the War Department as engaged in the fulfillment of Government contracts placed since the date of the inclusion of the contract clause relating to child labor, and in 6 other plants inspected, exclusive of shipyards, it was found that Government orders had also been placed. Except for the shipyards and 4 other plants, 3 of which were merely filling purchase orders and had no contract with the Government, all the plants inspected reported that their Government orders had been completed or canceled previous to the date of inspection.

The largest number of inspections made in any one industry was 23, in textile mills. Three of the factories inspected made uniforms, 1 men's shirts, 1 shoes, 2 metal goods, and 1 asbestos linings. Four were shipbuilding plants.

In the textile mills children were employed in doffing, winding, creeling, spinning, weaving, quilling, twister tending, warping, splicing, sweeping, oiling, and cleaning. Two thread mills made their own spools and tubes, and children were engaged there in such occupations as polishing and tapering spools and feeding forms for labeling. In 2 textile mills boys were found working in occupations forbidden by State law. One of these boys, who was employed for odd jobs, was soldering at the time of the inspections, and the other was operating a wood-turning machine in the spool department of a thread mill.

Children were employed in the uniform factory as machine operators, markers, helpers, examiners, trimmers, buttonhole makers, and clerks.

In the 32 factories inspected, exclusive of shipyards, 509 children under 16 were found at work, of whom 458 were employed in textile

[45] Unpublished figures in office of superintendent of education

mills. Seven children employed in 4 textile mills were found on investigation by the Federal inspectors to be only 13 years of age. Employment certificates giving their age as 14 or over were, however, on file for 6 of these children, so that although they were actually under legal working age, they were not employed in intentional disregard of the law. Violations of the State and Federal hour standards were much more frequent. Sixty-seven children under 16 were found to be working for more than 8 hours a day, 62 of whom were employed in 8 textile mills, 2 in a factory manufacturing men's shirts, 1 in a factory manufacturing clothing specialties, 1 in a shoe factory, and 1 in a metal goods factory. Thirty-eight of these violations were found in 1 plant. Time records were easily accessible in almost all the establishments inspected, and on the whole were satisfactorily kept, except that in some cases there was no record of pieceworkers' time. In the majority of cases, children whose working day was longer than the law permitted had misrepresented their age, claiming to be over 16, and their statements had been accepted by the employer without corroborative evidence. Certificates were not on file for 84, or 16.7 per cent, of the 502 children between 14 and 16 years of age.

TABLE XIV.—*Number of mills and factories inspected in New Jersey after June 3, 1918, and number of children employed in violation of Federal and State age and hour standards, by industry.*

Industry.	Mills and factories inspected.	Children employed in violation of Federal and State age and hour standards.			
		Age.		Hour.	
		Federal.	State.	Federal.	State.
Total	36	14	14	72	72
Total exclusive of shipbuilding	32	1	1	67	67
Cotton goods	7	.....	.....	42	42
Silk goods	8	.....	.....	2	2
Woolen and worsted goods	3	.....	.....	6	6
Linen goods	3	1	1	10	10
Other textiles [1]	2	.....	.....	2	2
Clothing	5	.....	.....	3	3
All other industries [2]	4	.....	.....	2	2
Shipbuilding	4	13	13	5	5
Steel ships	4	13	13	5	5
Wooden ships	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....

[1] Other textiles embrace: Jute goods, 1 establishment; dyeing and finishing, 1 establishment.
[2] All other industries embrace: Boots and shoes, 1 establishment; hardware, 1 establishment; metal novelties, 1 establishment; and asbestos goods, 1 establishment.

The requirements of the child-labor law were somewhat less carefully observed in the shipyards than in other industries. This was probably due in part at least to the fact that minors under 16 had only recently begun to be employed in the shipbuilding plants, and that the increase in the employment of children in that industry had

been very rapid. According to the statistics of the industry taken by the United States Census Bureau in 1914 and 1916, no minors under 16 were employed in the New Jersey shipyards in those years.[46] In the spring of 1919, after the rush of war production had somewhat subsided, inspectors of the Child-Labor Division personally interviewed 233 children under 16 years of age who were working in the four shipyards inspected in the State. In addition, a number of New Jersey children were found working in shipbuilding plants in New York and Pennsylvania.

Among the 233 children under 16 years of age working in the New Jersey shipyards, there were 13 boys employed in three different plants who were under 14 years of age. Fewer children (5) were found working in violation of the State and Federal regulations regarding hours. At the time of the inspections, however, most of the shipyards had eliminated overtime work, and information secured by the inspectors pointed to the fact that, prior to the armistice and the resumption of a strict 8-hour day, disregard of the hour standards for children had been much more frequent.

It was in the observance of the certificate law that the greatest carelessness was shown by the management of the shipbuilding plants. While certificates were lacking for only one-sixth of the children employed in the other industries, 158 boys employed in the shipyards, or more than two-thirds of the total number (233), were working without certificates. A number of these boys had previously been certificated for other jobs, but when applying for work at the shipyards they had given their ages as 16 or over, and their statements had been accepted without verification.

The danger in the employment of minors in the shipbuilding industry was of more moment than might appear from the actual violations of State and Federal regulations encountered in the inspections. At least 107 boys under 16 were found in occupations which exposed them to hazards from which legislation in certain other States protected children of their age. No law or ruling protected children in New Jersey from the dangers involved in shipbuilding. Moreover, probably because the employment of children in shipyards was so recent a development, no interpretation of the clause in the State law regulating the employment of children in hazardous trades had been made which applied to shipbuilding occupations.

Employment certificates were issued by local school authorities, usually either the superintendent of schools, the chief attendance officer, or a clerk under the direction of one of these officials. The law attempted to secure a certain degree of uniformity of administration by requiring that the State commissioner of education should

[46] Census of shipbuilding (including boat building), 1914 and 1916, Washington, 1919.

prescribe all forms to be used in connection with the issuing of certificates throughout the State. In addition, copies of all certificates issued, together with the original papers on the basis of which they were granted, had to be sent for examination to the State commissioner of labor, who was required to notify the State and local educational authorities if any had been illegally issued. Power to demand the cancellation of any certificate which had been improperly issued was lodged with the State commissioner of education.

In only one city were the issuing officer and other school authorities found so indifferent to the purpose of the law as knowingly to waive any of its requirements. Generally the issuing officers were found to be entirely in sympathy with the purpose of the child-labor law and anxious to enforce its provisions thoroughly. In administering the law, however, they differed considerably in their standards of efficiency, according to their training and qualifications and the amount of other work that they were called upon to do. As in other States where certificates were issued by local school authorities, the law was usually most efficiently administered in the larger cities, where the numbers of children going to work necessitated the appointment of special officers who gave their whole time to the work of certificating, instead of attending to it incidentally as one of a large number of duties. On the other hand, some of the most effective work, especially in following up children to whom certificates had been issued, was done in smaller industrial communities. In at least one town the chief attendance officer in addition to his other duties made a point of personally inspecting small establishments suspected of violating the law. Generally, however, the staff appointed to enforce the law was so small that it was impossible to follow up effectively the cases of all certificated children to see that they were not illegally employed and to secure their immediate return to school if they were out of work.

The requirements of the law regarding proof of age were generally found to be well enforced, probably due, to some extent at least, to the centralized supervision exerted by State authorities. Wherever the law permitted any leeway, however, considerable variation in practice was found. Thus, while birth and baptismal records were, as the law required, always given preference, officials differed as to the acceptability of other kinds of documentary evidence. Again, according to the law, if no documentary evidence was available, a certificate of the child's physical age based on an examination by a school physician might be accepted as proof of age. In such cases, however, the law required that an investigation of the child's age must be made, and permitted a delay of 60 days before the issuance of the certificate, thus giving the authorities every opportunity to locate documentary evidence. In practice, advantage was not always

taken of this provision and, even when it was, the thoroughness with which search was made for documentary evidence during the delay varied in degree according to the standards of the local issuing officers. In a number of cases investigated by the Federal inspectors where children were given work permits on physicians' certificates of age, satisfactory documentary evidence was readily found; and this sometimes showed the child to be younger than the age given in the physician's certificate—in a few instances even below legal working age. In most cases this documentary evidence, chiefly birth and baptismal records, could easily have been secured by the issuing officer through correspondence.

The New Jersey law required that children under 16 who were not legally employed must be in school. In order that the school authorities might have some means of knowing whether a child who had been given a working permit was actually at work, the law required that a child must make a new application for a certificate whenever he went into a new job, and also that the employer notify the issuing officer within two days after the child began to work, stating the nature of his employment and the date of its commencement. Since the law did not require that the child must secure a written promise of employment before he was given a certificate, it is obvious that few returns would be secured in this way without consistent effort on the part of the issuing officers in following up negligent employers. In most communities, however, little effort was made to follow up these cases. The issuing officer merely gave the child to whom a certificate had been issued a form to present to the employer, with instructions that it be filled out and returned to the school authorities. In some offices, employers were written or telephoned to if the return was not made. In only a few cities were the issuing officers successful in securing returns from employers in almost every case. The most effective method of securing the employer's compliance—used, however, in only one city—was by retaining the certificate in the issuing office until the employer's certificate had been returned. The child was given a form stating that a certificate had been issued to him and that as soon as the employer filled out and returned the notice of commencement of employment the certificate would be mailed to him. As the employer can be held liable for violation of the child-labor law if the working permit is not filed, a prompt return of the employer's certificate was usually secured.

The most serious defect in the certificate situation in New Jersey, however, lay not in the method of issuing, but in the fact that large numbers of children could obtain employment and continue work without any certificates at all. While employers in general appeared desirous of complying with the requirements of the child-labor law regarding age and hours, a number of them seemed unaware of the

importance of conforming to the requirements regarding certificates. Most of the violations of the certificate law, as of the requirements regarding hours, were found in plants where the management was careless in giving employment to children who claimed to be 16 without making any attempt to secure proof that they were the age claimed. The shipbuilding plants, where the employment of children was an innovation, were the most serious offenders in this respect. In three of the four yards inspected, the majority of children under 16 were working without certificates. In one plant only 3 of the 64 children under 16 who were interviewed at work had certificates on file. While greater conformity with the requirements of the law was found in the other industries, where it had been the custom for many years to employ children, nevertheless, in a number of such establishments, including some of the larger mills inspected, children under 16 had apparently found it easy, by misrepresenting their ages, to obtain employment on a full-time basis. In one large mill, 40 children claiming to be over 16 were found by the Federal inspectors to be under that age. Thirty-eight of these were working over 8 hours a day.

183106°—21——11

APPENDIXES.

APPENDIX I. TABLES.

TABLE A.—*Number and per cent of children for whom Federal certificates of age were issued, Sept. 1, 1917, to June 3, 1918, on the basis of specified evidence of age, by State of issuance and color of child.*

State of issuance and color of child.	Children issued certificates on the basis of specified evidence accepted as proof of age.															
	Total.		Birth certificate.		Baptismal certificate.		Bible record.		Life insurance policy.		Other documentary evidence.		Certificate of physical age.		Not reported.	
	Number.	Per cent.	Number.	Per cent.	Number.	Per cent.	Number.	Per cent.	Number.	Per cent.	Number.	Per cent.	Number.	Per cent.	Number.	Per cent.
Total	19,696	100.0	150	0.8	453	2.3	7,967	40.4	5,564	28.2	711	3.6	4,834	24.5	17	0.1
White	18,521	100.0	136	.7	439	2.4	7,687	41.5	5,092	27.5	692	3.7	4,458	24.1	17	.1
Colored	1,174	100.0	14	1.2	14	1.2	279	23.8	472	40.3	19	1.6	376	32.0	.....	.....
Not reported	1	100.0	.....	.....	.....	.....	1	100.0	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
North Carolina	9,377	100.0	15	.2	238	2.5	4,198	44.8	2,570	27.4	334	3.6	2,015	21.5	7	.1
White	8,590	100.0	14	.2	226	2.6	4,017	46.8	2,251	26.2	325	3.8	1,750	20.4	7	.1
Colored	787	100.0	1	.1	12	1.5	181	23.0	319	40.5	9	1.1	265	33.7	.....	.....
South Carolina	5,874	100.0	17	.3	26	.4	2,302	39.2	1,668	28.4	277	4.7	1,574	26.8	10	.2
White	5,758	100.0	16	.3	26	.5	2,262	39.3	1,640	28.5	272	4.7	1,532	26.6	10	.2
Colored	116	100.0	1	.9	.....	.....	40	34.5	28	24.1	5	4.3	42	36.2	.....	.....
Georgia	2,897	100.0	40	1.4	43	1.5	1,086	37.5	734	5.3	65	2.2	929	32.1	.....	.....
White	2,837	100.0	35	1.2	43	1.5	1,067	37.6	724	25.5	63	2.2	905	31.9	.....	.....
Colored	60	100.0	5	8.3	.....	.....	19	31.7	10	16.7	2	3.3	24	40.0	.....	.....
Virginia	1,210	100.0	72	6.0	104	8.6	290	24.0	578	47.8	26	2.1	140	11.6	.....	.....
White	999	100.0	65	6.5	102	10.2	250	25.0	463	46.3	23	2.3	96	9.6	.....	.....
Colored	210	100.0	7	3.3	2	1.0	39	18.6	115	54.8	3	1.4	44	21.0	.....	.....
Not reported	1	100.0	.....	.....	.....	.....	1	100.0	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Mississippi	338	100.0	6	1.8	42	12.4	91	26.9	14	4.1	9	2.7	176	52.1	.....	.....
White	337	100.0	6	1.8	42	12.5	91	27.0	14	4.2	9	2.7	175	51.9	.....	.....
Colored	1	100.0	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1	100.0	.....	.....

TABLE B.—*Number and per cent of children for whom Federal certificates of age were refused, Sept. 1, 1917, to June 3, 1918, on the basis of specified evidence of age, by State of issuance and color of child.*

State of issuance and color of child.	Children refused certificates on the basis of specified evidence accepted as proof of age.																			
	Total.		Birth certificate.		Baptismal certificate.		Bible record.		Life insurance policy.		Other documentary evidence.		Certificate of physical age.		School record.		Parent's, guardian's, or child's statement.		Not reported.	
	Number.	Per cent.	Number.	Per cent.	Number.	Per cent.	Number.	Per cent.	Number.	Per cent.	Number.	Per cent.	Number.	Per cent.	Number.	Per cent.	Number.	Per cent.	Number.	Per cent.
Total	2,156	100.0	6	0.3	34	1.6	255	11.8	636	29.5	36	1.7	404	18.7	413	19.2	369	17.1	3	0.1
White	1,621	100.0	5	0.3	31	1.9	205	12.6	472	29.1	29	1.8	346	21.3	336	20.7	196	12.1	1	0.1
Colored	398	100.0	1	0.3	3	0.8	28	7.0	143	35.9	5	1.3	42	10.6	74	18.6	100	25.1	2	0.5
Not reported	137	100.0	.....	.....	.....	.....	22	16.1	21	15.3	2	1.5	16	11.7	3	2.2	73	53.3	.....	.....
North Carolina	1,097	100.0	.....	.....	15	1.4	130	11.9	379	34.5	20	1.8	149	13.6	194	17.7	207	81.9	3	0.3
White	738	100.0	.....	.....	14	1.9	100	13.6	255	34.6	16	2.2	116	15.7	138	18.7	98	13.3	1	0.1
Colored	246	100.0	.....	.....	1	0.4	13	5.3	105	42.7	2	0.8	24	9.8	53	21.5	46	18.7	2	0.8
Not reported	113	100.0	.....	.....	.....	.....	17	15.0	19	16.8	2	1.8	9	8.0	3	2.7	63	55.8	.....	.....
South Carolina	377	100.0	1	0.3	3	0.8	53	14.1	119	31.6	6	1.6	134	35.5	21	5.6	40	10.6	.....	.....
White	333	100.0	1	0.3	3	0.9	46	13.8	112	33.6	3	0.9	124	37.2	20	6.0	24	7.2	.....	.....
Colored	33	100.0	.....	.....	.....	.....	4	12.1	7	21.2	3	9.1	3	9.1	1	3.0	15	45.5	.....	.....
Not reported	11	100.0	.....	.....	.....	.....	3	27.3	.....	.....	.....	.....	7	63.6	.....	.....	1	9.1	.....	.....
Georgia	388	100.0	3	0.8	1	0.3	50	12.9	63	16.2	5	1.3	63	16.2	146	37.6	57	14.7	.....	.....
White	355	100.0	2	0.6	1	0.3	47	13.2	60	16.9	5	1.4	62	17.5	136	38.3	42	11.8	.....	.....
Colored	25	100.0	1	4.0	.....	.....	1	4.0	2	8.0	.....	.....	1	4.0	10	40.0	10	40.0	.....	.....
Not reported	8	100.0	.....	.....	.....	.....	2	25.0	1	12.5	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	5	62.5	.....	.....
Virginia	228	100.0	1	0.4	6	2.6	19	8.3	75	32.9	4	1.8	34	14.9	34	14.9	55	24.1	.....	.....
White	134	100.0	1	0.7	4	3.0	10	7.5	45	33.6	4	3.0	20	14.9	25	18.7	25	18.7	.....	.....
Colored	91	100.0	.....	.....	2	2.2	9	9.9	29	31.9	.....	.....	14	15.4	9	9.9	28	30.8	.....	.....
Not reported	3	100.0	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1	33.3	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	2	66.7	.....	.....
Mississippi	66	100.0	1	1.5	9	13.6	3	4.5	.....	.....	1	1.5	24	36.4	18	27.3	10	15.2	.....	.....
White	61	100.0	1	1.6	9	14.8	2	3.3	.....	.....	1	1.6	24	39.3	17	27.9	7	11.5	.....	.....
Colored	3	100.0	.....	.....	.....	.....	1	33.3	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1	33.3	1	33.3	.....	.....
Not reported	2	100.0	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	2	100.0	.....	.....

TABLE C.—*Children for whom Federal certificates of age were issued, Sept. 1, 1917, to June 3, 1918, classified by number of positions held during specified period of time, and by sex and color.*

Period of time.	Total.	Boys.	Girls.	Number of positions.														
				One.			Two.			Three.			Four.			Five.		
				Total.	Boys.	Girls.	Total.	Boys.	Girls.	Total.	Boys.	Girls.	Total.	Boys.	Girls.	Total.	Boys.	Girls.
Total	19,696	9,996	9,700	17,848	9,028	8,820	1,520	789	731	292	158	134	34	20	14	2	1	1
Under 1 month	2,809	1,505	1,304	2,790	1,495	1,295	18	10	8	1	.....	1	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
1 month but under 2	1,417	734	683	1,390	715	675	27	19	8	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
2 months but under 3	1,387	684	703	1,335	658	677	46	24	22	5	2	3	1	.....	1	.....	.....	.....
3 months but under 4	1,139	595	544	1,076	565	511	63	30	33	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
4 months but under 5	1,302	692	610	1,187	636	551	104	50	54	11	6	5	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
5 months but under 6	1,133	545	588	1,026	494	532	89	43	46	14	5	9	3	2	1	1	1	.....
6 months but under 7	1,446	689	757	1,288	591	697	141	87	54	16	10	6	1	1	.....	.....	.....	.....
7 months but under 8	1,734	871	863	1,536	780	756	164	73	91	32	16	16	2	2	.....	.....	.....	.....
8 months but under 9	1,486	748	738	1,288	645	643	156	84	72	40	18	22	2	1	1	.....	.....	.....
9 months but under 10	5,722	2,856	2,866	4,813	2,373	2,440	710	368	342	173	101	72	25	14	11	1	.....	1
Inapplicable	119	75	41	117	74	43	2	1	1	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Not reported	2	2	.....	2	2	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
White	18,521	9,280	9,241	16,746	8,351	8,395	1,454	753	701	285	155	130	34	20	14	2	1	1
Under 1 month	2,488	1,277	1,211	2,470	1,267	1,203	18	10	8	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
1 month but under 2	1,351	692	659	1,324	673	651	27	19	8	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
2 months but under 3	1,306	638	668	1,255	613	642	45	23	22	5	2	3	1	.....	1	.....	.....	.....
3 months but under 4	1,067	545	522	1,005	516	489	62	29	33	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
4 months but under 5	1,235	647	588	1,125	593	532	100	48	52	10	6	4	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
5 months but under 6	1,076	512	564	975	466	509	83	38	45	14	5	9	3	2	1	1	1	.....
6 months but under 7	1,380	656	724	1,229	564	665	135	82	53	15	9	6	1	1	.....	.....	.....	.....
7 months but under 8	1,629	810	819	1,437	721	716	160	72	88	30	15	15	2	2	.....	.....	.....	.....
8 months but under 9	1,375	688	687	1,193	593	600	141	76	65	39	18	21	2	1	1	.....	.....	.....
9 months but under 10	5,500	2,742	2,758	4,621	2,273	2,348	681	355	326	172	100	72	25	14	11	1	.....	1
Inapplicable	112	71	41	110	70	40	2	1	1	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Not reported	2	2	.....	2	2	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Colored	1,174	715	459	1,101	676	425	66	36	30	7	3	4	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Under 1 month	320	227	93	319	227	92	.....	.....	.....	1	.....	1	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
1 month but under 2	66	42	24	66	42	24	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
2 months but under 3	81	46	35	80	45	35	1	1	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
3 months but under 4	72	50	22	71	49	22	1	1	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
4 months but under 5	67	45	22	62	43	19	4	2	2	1	.....	1	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
5 months but under 6	57	33	24	51	28	23	6	5	1	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
6 months but under 7	66	33	33	59	27	32	6	5	1	1	1	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
7 months but under 8	105	61	44	99	59	40	4	1	3	2	1	1	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
8 months but under 9	111	60	51	95	52	43	15	8	7	1	.....	1	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
9 months but under 10	222	114	108	192	100	92	29	13	16	1	1	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Inapplicable	7	4	3	7	4	3	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Color not reported	1	1	.....	1	1	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Under 1 month	1	1	.....	1	1	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....

TABLE D.—*Children for whom Federal certificates of age were issued, Sept. 1, 1917, to June 3, 1918, holding positions in specified number of industries, by number of positions held.*

Number of positions held.	Children for whom certificates were issued holding positions in specified number of industries.			
	Total.	One.	Two.	Three.
Total	19,696	19,503	191	2
One	17,848	17,848	.....	.....
Two	1,520	1,364	156	.....
Three	292	260	31	1
Four	34	29	4	1
Five	2	2	.....	.....

TABLE E.—*Children for whom Federal certificates of age were issued Sept. 1, 1917, to June 3, 1918, holding positions in specified number of communities, by number of positions held.*

Number of positions held.	Children for whom certificates were issued holding positions in specified number of communities.				
	Total.	One.	Two.	Three.	Four.
Total	19,696	18,886	769	38	3
One	17,848	17,848	.....	.....	.....
Two	1,520	875	645	.....	.....
Three	292	142	116	34	.....
Four	34	19	8	4	3
Five	2	2	.....	.....	.....

TABLE F.—*Number and per cent distribution of children for whom Federal certificates of age were issued, Sept. 1, 1917, to June 3, 1918, by industry for which first certificated and by sex and State.*

NUMBER.

Industry.	Total.			North Carolina.			South Carolina.			Georgia.			Virginia.			Mississippi.		
	Both sexes.	Boys.	Girls.	Both sexes.	Boys.	Girls.	Both sexes.	Boys.	Girls.	Both sexes.	Boys.	Girls.	Both sexes.	Boys.	Girls.	Both sexes.	Boys.	Girls.
Total	19,696	9,996	9,700	9,377	4,650	4,727	5,874	3,006	2,868	2,897	1,480	1,417	1,210	702	508	338	158	180
Textiles and textile manufactures	17,181	8,521	8,660	8,138	3,938	4,200	5,738	2,944	2,794	2,743	1,367	1,376	294	143	151	268	129	139
Textile fabrics and materials	17,030	8,444	8,586	8,126	3,931	4,195	5,677	2,895	2,782	2,697	1,361	1,336	265	130	135	265	127	138
Cotton goods	14,501	7,450	7,051	6,361	3,252	3,109	5,559	2,843	2,716	2,243	1,185	1,058	112	61	51	226	109	117
Hosiery and knit goods	2,198	846	1,352	1,535	581	954	106	46	60	404	149	255	114	52	62	39	18	21
Silk goods	196	69	127	161	57	104	.....	.....	.....	15	6	9	20	6	14	.....	.....	.....
Woolen and worsted goods	76	44	32	22	12	10	.....	.....	.....	35	21	14	19	11	8	.....	.....	.....
Other	59	35	24	47	29	18	12	6	6	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Articles from textile fabrics for personal wear	135	64	71	11	6	5	57	47	10	45	5	40	19	4	15	3	2	1
Clothing (men's)	122	58	64	2	.....	2	53	47	6	45	5	40	19	4	15	3	2	1
Other	13	6	7	9	6	3	4	.....	4	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Other textile manufactures	16	13	3	1	1	.....	4	2	2	1	1	.....	10	9	1	.....	.....	.....
Lumber and its remanufactures	340	314	26	233	221	12	11	11	.....	21	20	1	75	62	13	.....	.....	.....
Leather and leather goods	132	112	20	4	3	1	.....	.....	.....	30	27	3	98	82	16	.....	.....	.....
Paper and printing	81	26	55	2	.....	2	.....	.....	.....	16	3	13	63	23	40	.....	.....	.....
Tobacco manufacture	1,432	585	847	902	408	494	94	25	69	15	4	11	421	148	273	.....	.....	.....
Stemmed and assorted tobacco	178	89	89	85	30	55	19	7	12	.....	.....	.....	74	52	22	.....	.....	.....
Chewing and smoking tobacco	539	296	243	486	260	226	26	13	13	.....	.....	.....	27	23	4	.....	.....	.....
Cigars and cigarettes	669	171	498	286	89	197	48	5	43	15	4	11	320	73	247	.....	.....	.....
Other not specified	46	29	17	45	29	16	1	.....	1	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Shipbuilding	152	150	2	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	152	150	2	.....	.....	.....
Mines and quarries	20	19	1	6	6	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	14	13	1	.....	.....	.....
Other	354	265	89	91	73	18	31	26	5	72	59	13	90	78	12	70	29	41
Not reported	4	4	.....	1	1	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	3	3	.....	.....	.....	.....

TABLE F.—*Number and per cent distribution of children for whom Federal certificates of age were issued, Sept. 1, 1917, to June 3, 1918, by industry for which first certificated and by sex and State*—Continued.

PER CENT DISTRIBUTION.

Industry.	Total.			North Carolina.			South Carolina.			Georgia.			Virginia.			Mississippi.		
	Both sexes.	Boys.	Girls.	Both sexes.	Boys.	Girls.	Both sexes.	Boys.	Girls.	Both sexes.	Boys.	Girls.	Both sexes.	Boys.	Girls.	Both sexes.	Boys.	Girls.
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Textiles and textile manufactures	87.2	85.2	89.3	86.8	84.7	88.9	97.7	97.9	97.4	94.7	92.4	97.1	24.3	20.4	29.7	79.3	81.6	77.2
Textile fabrics and materials	86.5	84.5	88.5	86.7	84.5	88.7	96.6	96.3	97.0	93.1	92.0	94.3	21.9	18.5	26.6	78.4	80.4	76.7
Cotton goods	73.6	74.5	72.7	67.8	69.9	65.8	94.6	94.6	94.7	77.4	80.1	74.7	9.3	8.7	10.0	66.9	69.0	65.0
Hosiery and knit goods	11.2	8.5	13.9	16.4	12.5	20.2	1.8	1.5	2.1	13.9	10.1	18.0	9.4	7.4	12.2	11.5	11.4	11.7
Silk goods	1.0	.7	1.3	1.7	1.2	2.2	.....	.....	.....	.5	.4	.6	1.7	.9	2.8	.....	.....	.....
Woolen and worsted goods	.4	.4	.3	.2	.3	.2	.....	.....	.....	1.2	1.4	1.0	1.6	1.6	1.6	.....	.....	.....
Other	.3	.4	.2	.5	.6	.4	.2	.2	.2	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Articles from textile fabrics for personal wear	.7	.6	.7	.1	.1	.1	1.0	1.6	.3	1.6	.3	2.8	1.6	.6	3.0	.9	1.3	.6
Clothing (men's)	.6	.6	.7	(1)	.....	(1)	.9	1.6	.2	1.6	.3	2.8	1.6	.6	3.0	.9	1.3	.6
Other	.1	.1	.1	.1	.1	.1	.1	.....	.1	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Other textile manufactures	.1	.1	(1)	(1)	(1)	.....	.1	.1	.1	(1)	.1	.....	.8	1.3	.2	.....	.....	.....
Lumber and its remanufactures	1.7	3.1	.3	2.5	4.8	.3	.2	.4	.....	.7	1.4	.1	6.2	8.8	2.6	.....	.....	.....
Leather and leather goods	.7	1.1	.2	(1)	.1	(1)	.....	.....	.....	1.0	1.8	.2	8.1	11.7	3.1	.....	.....	.....
Paper and printing	.4	.3	.6	(1)	.....	(1)	.....	.....	.....	.6	.2	.9	5.2	3.3	7.9	.....	.....	.....
Tobacco manufacture	7.3	5.9	8.7	9.6	8.8	10.5	1.6	.8	2.4	.5	.3	.8	34.8	21.1	53.7	.....	.....	.....
Stemmed and assorted tobacco	.9	.9	.9	.9	.6	1.2	.3	.2	.4	.....	.....	.....	6.1	7.4	4.3	.....	.....	.....
Chewing and smoking tobacco	2.7	3.0	2.5	5.2	5.6	4.8	.4	.4	.5	.....	.....	.....	2.2	3.3	.8	.....	.....	.....
Cigars and cigarettes	3.4	1.7	5.1	3.1	1.9	4.2	.8	.2	1.5	.5	.3	.8	26.4	10.4	48.6	.....	.....	.....
Other not specified	.2	.3	.2	.5	.6	.3	(1)	.....	(1)	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Shipbuilding	.8	1.5	(1)	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	12.6	21.4	.4	.....	.....	.....
Mines and quarries	.1	.2	(1)	.1	.1	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1.2	1.9	.2	.....	.....	.....
Other	1.8	2.7	.9	1.0	1.6	.4	.5	.9	.2	2.5	4.0	.9	7.4	11.1	2.4	20.7	18.4	22.8
Not reported	(1)	(1)	.....	(1)	(1)	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.2	.4	.....	.....	.....	.....

[1] Less than one-tenth of 1 per cent.

TABLE G.—*Children for whom Federal certificates of age were issued, Sept. 1, 1917, to June 3, 1918, in specified State of issuance, by country and State of birth.*

Country and State of birth.	Total children.	State of issuance.				
		North Carolina.	South Carolina.	Georgia.	Virginia.	Mississippi.
Total	19,696	9,377	5,874	2,897	1,210	338
United States	19,629	9,348	5,859	2,890	1,203	329
Alabama	381	14	27	320	2	21
Florida	22	8	5	8	1	.....
Georgia	2,700	40	361	2,293	5	1
Louisiana	34	2	1	4	.....	27
Mississippi	275	4	3	7	2	259
North Carolina	9,406	8,569	708	37	91	1
South Carolina	4,998	339	4,555	92	11	1
Tennessee	285	50	146	80	3	6
Texas	48	9	14	23	.....	2
Virginia	1,341	269	18	4	1,050	.....
All others	136	44	21	22	38	11
Foreign countries	24	2	5	2	7	8
Not reported	43	27	10	5	.....	1

TABLE H.—*Number and character of violations of Federal age and hour standards found in the inspection of mills, canneries, factories, workshops, and manufacturing establishments, Sept. 1, 1917, to June 3, 1918, by State.*

State.	Total number of establishments inspected.	Number of establishments violating Federal age and hour standards.					Number of children employed in violation of Federal age and hour standards.			
		Total.	Employing children under 14 years of age.	Employing children between 14 and 16 years of age.			Under 14 years of age.	Children between 14 and 16 years of age employed.		
				More than 8 hours a day.	More than 6 days a week.	Between 7 p. m. and 6 a. m.		More than 8 hours a day.	More than 6 days a week.	Between 7 p. m. and 6 a. m.
Total	689	293	136	235	2	35	385	978	3	116
Alabama	52	19	10	13	.....	1	14	28	.....	1
Arkansas	2	2	2	2	.....	.....	7	11	.....	.....
Delaware	19	9	7	9	.....	.....	42	59	1	.....
District of Columbia	7	1	1	.....	.....	.....	1	.....	.....	.....
Florida	14	7	4	5	.....	.....	30	12	.....	.....
Georgia	38	21	12	17	.....	5	24	99	.....	16
Illinois	32	6	.....	4	1	2	.....	11	1	4
Indiana	59	29	4	29	.....	3	4	152	.....	8
Iowa	21	3	.....	3	.....	.....	.....	8	.....	.....
Kansas	3	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Louisiana	7	2	1	2	.....	.....	1	6	.....	.....
Maryland	8	4	2	4	.....	1	16	29	.....	4
Minnesota	4	2	1	2	.....	.....	3	4	.....	.....
Mississippi	21	11	8	3	.....	3	30	3	.....	31
Missouri	4	1	.....	1	.....	.....	.....	1	.....	.....
Nebraska	1	1	1	1	.....	.....	6	16	.....	.....
New Jersey	14	5	1	5	.....	1	1	25	.....	1
North Carolina	109	50	30	38	1	8	95	144	1	18
Oklahoma	1	1	1	1	.....	.....	1	7	.....	.....
Pennsylvania	1	1	1	1	.....	1	3	8	.....	3
Rhode Island	20	16	3	16	.....	1	12	70	.....	1
South Carolina	64	19	9	16	.....	1	20	48	.....	1
Tennessee	61	21	6	21	.....	2	10	50	.....	14
Virginia	57	26	20	10	.....	1	52	48	.....	7
West Virginia	70	36	12	32	.....	5	13	139	.....	7

TABLE I.—*Number and character of violations of Federal and State age and hour standards found in the inspection of mills, canneries, factories, workshops, and manufacturing establishments (exclusive of shipyards) from June 3, 1918, to Apr. 24, 1919, by State.*

State.	Total number of establishments inspected.	Number of establishments violating age and hour standards.		Number of children employed in violation of age and hour standards.					
				Age.		Overtime.		Night.	
		Federal.	State.	Federal.[1]	State.	Federal.[2]	State.	Federal.	State.
Total	1,187	736	561	2,013	2,051	5,931	999	147	142
Arkansas	36	34	34	117	117	194	194	6	6
Connecticut	113	94	4			1,936	5		
Delaware	5	1	1	2	2	3			
Florida	15	11	8	5	5	28	11		
Illinois	1								
Indiana	1								
Kentucky	17	5	5	11	11	14	14		
Maine	1	1				1			
Maryland	217	192	192	741	741	115	115	6	6
Massachusetts	124	39	39	17	17	178	174		
Michigan	21	13	6	1	7	43	11		5
Minnesota	19	3	3			11	11		
New Hampshire	72	22	1	2	2	74			
New Jersey	32	13	13	1	1	67	67		
New York	138	23	23	3	3	31	31		
North Carolina	53	52	47	622	430	1,092	12	25	25
Ohio	95	62	81	99	327	172	235	48	100
Pennsylvania	19	9	6	8	8	128	52		
Rhode Island	37	24	4	6	6	317			
South Carolina	24	24	2	2	2	562		1	
Tennessee	1	1	1	3	3	12	12		
Texas	4								
Vermont	31	13	13	1	1	51	51		
Virginia	103	96	74	350	345	835	4		
West Virginia	7	4	4	23	23	67		61	
Wisconsin	1								

[1] Under 14 years of age.
[2] Employment of children between 14 and 16 years of age more than 8 hours a day or 6 days a week, or before 6 a. m. or after 7 p. m.

TABLE J.—*Number of mines inspected and number of children under 16, and under 14 years of age employed in mines inspected, prior and subsequent to June 3, 1918, by State.*

PRIOR TO JUNE 3.

State.	Number of mines inspected.	Number of children employed.	
		Under 16 years of age.	Under 14 years of age.
Total	28	168	12
Kentucky	2	5	1
Pennsylvania	15	145	10
Virginia	2	3	
West Virginia	9	15	1

SUBSEQUENT TO JUNE 3.

Total	15	111	8
Indiana	13	62	6
Pennsylvania	2	49	2

TABLE K.—*Number and character of violations of Federal and State child-labors tandards found in the inspection of shipyards after June 3, 1918, classified by State, and kind of ships manufactured.*

State and kind of ships manufactured.	Total number of establishments inspected.	Number of establishments violating age and hour standards.		Number of children under 16 years of age found at work.	Number of children employed in violation of age and hour standards.						Number of children employed in hazardous occupations prohibited by State law or ruling.
					Age.		Overtime.		Night.		
		Federal.	State.		Federal.	State.	Federal.	State.	Federal.	State.	
Total	110	37	41	1,618	143	134	137	156	2	2	447
Alabama	5	3	3	14	3	3	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Steel ships	3	3	3	11	3	3	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Wooden ships	1	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Concrete ships	1	.....	.....	3	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Connecticut	3	.....	.....	58	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Steel ships	1	.....	.....	48	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Wooden ships	2	.....	.....	10	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Delaware (steel ships)	2	.....	.....	32	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	5
Florida	12	5	5	47	13	13	19	18	.....	.....	.....
Steel ships	4	2	2	18	4	4	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Wooden ships	7	3	3	29	9	9	19	18	.....	.....	.....
Concrete ships	1	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Georgia	5	1	1	19	8	1	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Steel ships	1	1	1	16	8	1	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Wooden ships	4	.....	.....	3	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Illinois (steel ships)	1	.....	.....	3	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1
Louisiana	6	3	3	31	3	3	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Steel ships	4	2	2	15	2	2	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Wooden ships	2	1	1	16	1	1	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Maine	5	.....	.....	48	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Steel ships	2	.....	.....	48	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Wooden ships	3	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Maryland	7	1	1	75	.....	.....	1	1	.....	.....	155
Steel ships	4	1	1	65	.....	.....	1	1	.....	.....	148
Wooden ships	3	.....	.....	10	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	7
Massachusetts	3	1	1	62	1	1	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Steel ships	2	1	1	62	1	1	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Wooden ships	1	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Michigan (steel ships)	7	2	2	28	1	1	1	1	.....	.....	.....
Minnesota (steel ships)	1	.....	.....	3	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Mississippi (wooden ships)	3	.....	.....	3	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
New Hampshire	2	1	1	32	1	1	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Steel ships	1	1	1	25	1	1	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Wooden ships	1	.....	.....	7	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
New Jersey (steel ships)	4	4	4	233	13	13	5	5	.....	.....	38
New York	9	4	7	256	9	9	19	47	.....	.....	.....
Steel ships	8	4	7	254	9	9	19	47	.....	.....	.....
Wooden ships	1	.....	.....	2	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
North Carolina	3	2	2	31	7	4	8	.....	.....	.....	.....
Steel ships	1	1	1	25	6	3	7	.....	.....	.....	.....
Wooden ships	1	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Concrete ships	1	1	1	6	1	1	1	.....	.....	.....	.....
Ohio (steel ships)	4	.....	1	24	.....	1	.....	.....	.....	.....	24
Pennsylvania	6	4	4	369	28	28	82	82	2	2	223
Steel ships	5	3	3	367	27	27	82	82	2	2	221
Wooden ships	1	1	1	2	1	1	.....	.....	.....	.....	2
Texas (wooden ships)	9	3	3	24	5	5	2	2	.....	.....	.....
Virginia	5	3	3	224	51	51	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Steel ships	2	2	2	220	50	50	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Wooden ships	3	1	1	4	1	1	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Wisconsin	8	.....	.....	2	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1
Steel ships	6	.....	.....	2	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1
Wooden ships	2	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....

APPENDIX II.

TEXT OF FEDERAL CHILD-LABOR LAW OF 1916 AND RULES AND REGULATIONS FOR ITS ENFORCEMENT.

[PUBLIC—NO. 249—64TH CONGRESS.]

[H. R. 8234.]

AN ACT TO PREVENT INTERSTATE COMMERCE IN THE PRODUCTS OF CHILD LABOR, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That no producer, manufacturer, or dealer shall ship or deliver for shipment in interstate or foreign commerce any article or commodity the product of any mine or quarry, situated in the United States, in which within thirty days prior to the time of the removal of such product therefrom children under the age of sixteen years have been employed or permitted to work, or any article or commodity the product of any mill, cannery, workshop, factory, or manufacturing establishment, situated in the United States, in which within thirty days prior to the removal of such product therefrom children under the age of fourteen years have been employed or permitted to work, or children between the ages of fourteen years and sixteen years have been employed or permitted to work more than eight hours in any day, or more than six days in any week, or after the hour of seven o'clock postmeridian, or before the hour of six o'clock antemeridian: *Provided*, That a prosecution and conviction of a defendant for the shipment or delivery for shipment of any article or commodity under the conditions herein prohibited shall be a bar to any further prosecution against the same defendant for shipments or deliveries for shipment of any such article or commodity before the beginning of said prosecution.

SEC. 2. That the Attorney General, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Secretary of Labor shall constitute a board to make and publish from time to time uniform rules and regulations for carrying out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 3. That for the purpose of securing proper enforcement of this act the Secretary of Labor, or any person duly authorized by him, shall have authority to enter and inspect at any time mines, quarries, mills, canneries, workshops, factories, manufacturing establishments, and other places in which goods are produced or held for interstate commerce; and the Secretary of Labor shall have authority to employ

such assistance for the purposes of this act as may from time to time be authorized by appropriation or other law.

SEC. 4. That it shall be the duty of each district attorney to whom the Secretary of Labor shall report any violation of this act, or to whom any State factory or mining or quarry inspector, commissioner of labor, State medical inspector, or school-attendance officer, or any other person shall present satisfactory evidence of any such violation to cause appropriate proceedings to be commenced and prosecuted in the proper courts of the United States without delay for the enforcement of the penalities in such cases herein provided: *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall be construed to apply to bona fide boys' and girls' canning clubs recognized by the Agricultural Department of the several States and of the United States.

SEC. 5. That any person who violates any of the provisions of section one of this act, or who refuses or obstructs entry or inspection authorized by section three of this act, shall for each offense prior to the first conviction of such person under the provisions of this act, be punished by a fine of not more than $200, and shall for each offense subsequent to such conviction be punished by a fine of not more than $1,000, nor less than $100, or by imprisonment for not more than three months, or by both such fine and imprisonment, in the discretion of the court: *Provided*, That no dealer shall be prosecuted under the provisions of this act for a shipment, delivery for shipment, or transportation who establishes a guaranty issued by the person by whom the goods shipped or delivered for shipment or transportation were manufactured or produced, resident in the United States, to the effect that such goods were produced or manufactured in a mine or quarry in which within thirty days prior to their removal therefrom no children under the age of sixteen years were employed or permitted to work, or in a mill, cannery, workshop, factory, or manufacturing establishment, in which within thirty days prior to the removal of such goods therefrom no children under the age of fourteen years were employed or permitted to work, nor children between the ages of fourteen years and sixteen years employed or permitted to work more than eight hours in any day or more than six days in any week or after the hour of seven o'clock postmeridian or before the hour of six o'clock antemeridian; and in such event, if the guaranty contains any false statement of a material fact, the guarantor shall be amenable to prosecution and to the fine or imprisonment provided by this section for violation of the provisions of this act. Said guaranty, to afford the protection above provided, shall contain the name and address of the person giving the same: *And provided further*, That no producer, manufacturer, or dealer shall be prosecuted under this act for the shipment, delivery for shipment, or transportation of a product of any mine, quarry, mill, cannery, workshop, factory,

or manufacturing establishment, if the only employment therein, within thirty days prior to the removal of such product therefrom, of a child under the age of sixteen years has been that of a child as to whom the producer or manufacturer has in good faith procured, at the time of employing such child, and has since in good faith relied upon and kept on file a certificate, issued in such form, under such conditions, and by such persons as may be prescribed by the board, showing the child to be of such an age that the shipment, delivery for shipment, or transportation was not prohibited by this act. Any person who knowingly makes a false statement or presents false evidence in or in relation to any such certificate or application therefor shall be amenable to prosecution and to the fine or imprisonment provided by this section for violations of this act. In any State designated by the board, an employment certificate or other similar paper as to the age of the child, issued under the laws of that State and not inconsistent with the provisions of this act, shall have the same force and effect as a certificate herein provided for.

SEC. 6. That the word "person" as used in this act shall be construed to include any individual or corporation or the members of any partnership or other unincorporated association. The term "ship or deliver for shipment in interstate or foreign commerce" as used in this act means to transport or to ship or deliver for shipment from any State or Territory or the District of Columbia to or through any other State or Territory or the District of Columbia or to any foreign country; and in the case of a dealer means only to transport or to ship or deliver for shipment from the State, Territory, or district of manufacture or production.

SEC. 7. That this act shall take effect from and after one year from the date of its passage.

Approved, September 1, 1916.

RULES AND REGULATIONS FOR CARRYING OUT THE PROVISIONS OF AN ACT OF THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES APPROVED SEPTEMBER 1, 1916, ENTITLED "AN ACT TO PREVENT INTERSTATE COMMERCE IN THE PRODUCTS OF CHILD LABOR, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES," ADOPTED BY THE BOARD CONSISTING OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL, THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE, AND THE SECRETARY OF LABOR, AUGUST 14, 1917.

Regulation 1. Certificates of age.

Certificates of age, in order to protect the producer, manufacturer, or dealer from prosecution, shall be either:

1. *Federal age certificates issued by persons hereafter to be designated by the board for children between 16 and 17 years of age when employment in or about a mine or quarry is contemplated and for children between 14 and 16 years of age when employment in a mill, cannery, workshop, factory, or manufacturing establishment is contemplated.*

Such certificates shall contain the following information: (1) Name of child; (2) place and date of birth of child, together with statement of evidence on which this is based, except when a physician's certificate of physical age is accepted by the issuing officer, in which case physical age shall be shown; (3) sex and color; (4) signature of child; (5) name and address of child's parent, guardian, or custodian; (6) signature of issuing officer; and (7) date and place of issuance.

2. *Employment, age, or working certificate, permit, or paper issued under State authority in such States as are hereafter designated by the board.*

Regulation 2. Proof of age.

Persons authorized by the board to issue age certificates under the authority of this act shall issue such certificates only upon the application in person of the child desiring employment, accompanied by its parent, guardian, or custodian, and after having received, examined, and approved documentary evidence of age showing that the child is 14 years of age or over if employment in a mill, cannery, workshop, factory, or manufacturing establishment is contemplated, or that the child is between 16 and 17 years of age if employment in or about a mine or quarry is contemplated; which evidence shall consist of one of the following-named proofs of age, to be required in the order herein designated, as follows:

(*a*) A birth certificate or attested transcript thereof issued by a registrar of vital statistics or other officer charged with the duty of recording births.

(*b*) A record of baptism or a certificate or attested transcript thereof showing the date of birth and place of baptism of the child.

(*c*) A bona fide contemporary record of the date and place of the child's birth kept in the Bible in which the records of the births in the family of the child are preserved, or other documentary evidence satisfactory to the Secretary of Labor or such person as he may designate, such as a passport showing the age of the child, a certificate of arrival in the United States issued by the United States immigration officers and showing the age of the child, or a life insurance policy; provided that such other satisfactory documentary evidence has been in existence at least one year prior to the time it is offered in evidence; and provided further that a school record or a parent's, guardian's, or custodian's affidavit, certificate, or other written statement of age shall not be accepted except as specified in paragraph (*d*).

(*d*) A certificate signed by a public-health physician or a public-school physician, specifying what in the opinion of such physician is the physical age of the child; such certificate shall show the height and weight of the child and other facts concerning its physical development revealed by such examination and upon which the opinion of

the physician as to the physical age of the child is based. A parent's, guardian's, or custodian's certificate as to the age of the child and a record of age as given on the register of the school which the child first attended or in the school census, if obtainable, shall be submitted with the physician's certificate showing physical age.

The officer issuing the age certificate for a child shall require the evidence of age specified in subdivision (*a*) in preference to that specified in any subsequent subdivision and shall not accept the evidence of age permitted by any subsequent subdivision unless he shall receive and file evidence that the evidence of age required by the preceding subdivision or subdivisions can not be obtained.

Regulation 3. Authorization of acceptance of State certificates.

States in which the age, employment, or working certificates, permits, or papers are issued under State authority substantially in accord with the requirements of the act and with regulation 2 hereof may be designated, in accordance with section 5 of the act, as States in which certificates issued under State authority shall have the same force and effect as those issued under the direct authority of this act, except as individual certificates may be suspended or revoked in accordance with regulations 4 and 8. Certificates in States so designated shall have this force and effect for the period of time specified by the board, unless in the judgment of the board the withdrawal of such authorization at an earlier date seems desirable for the effective administration of the act. Certificates requiring conditions or restrictions additional to those required by the Federal act or by the rules and regulations shall not be deemed to be inconsistent with the act.

Regulation 4. Suspension or revocation of certificates.

SECTION 1. Whenever an inspector duly authorized under this act shall find that the age of a child employed in any mill, cannery, workshop, factory, manufacturing establishment, mine, or quarry as given on a certificate is incorrect, or that the time record is not kept in accordance with regulation 8, he shall notify the child, the employer, and the issuing officer that the certificate or the acceptance of a State certificate for the purposes of this act is suspended and indicate such suspension on the certificate or certificates.

SEC. 2. A statement of the facts for which the suspension was made shall be forwarded by the inspector to the Secretary of Labor, or such person as he may designate, who will either (*a*) revoke or withdraw the certificate or the acceptance of the certificate, or (*b*) veto the suspension, as in his judgment the facts of the case warrant.

Due notice shall be sent to the child's parent, guardian, or custodian, to the employer, and to the issuing officer of the action taken in regard to a suspended certificate.

SEC. 3. If the suspension of a certificate be vetoed, a new certificate shall be issued upon the surrender of the one suspended. If for any reason such new certificate can not be obtained from a State issuing officer, the notice of the veto if attached to a suspended certificate shall be recognized and accepted as meeting the requirements of section 5 of the act.

Regulation 5. Revoked or suspended certificates.

A revoked or suspended certificate will not protect a producer, manufacturer, or dealer from prosecution under section 5 of the act after notice of such suspension or revocation, except as provided in regulation 4.

Regulation 6. Hours of employment.

In determining whether children between 14 and 16 years of age have been employed more than eight hours in any day the hours of employment shall be computed from the time the child is required or permitted or suffered to be at the place of employment up to the time when he leaves off work for the day, exclusive of a single continuous period of a definite length of time during which the child is off work and not subject to call.

Regulation 7. Days of employment.

A child may not be employed for more than six consecutive days.

Regulation 8. Time record.

SECTION 1. A time record shall be kept daily by producers or manufacturers, showing the hours of employment in accordance with regulation 6, for each and every child between 14 and 16 years of age, whether employed on a time or a piece-rate basis.

SEC. 2. Certificates of age for children employed in any mine or quarry or in any mill, cannery, workshop, factory, or manufacturing establishment may be suspended or revoked for failure on the part of a manufacturer or producer to keep time records as required by this regulation or for false or fraudulent entries made therein.

Regulation 9. Inspection.

An inspector duly authorized under this act shall have the right to enter and inspect any mine or quarry, mill, cannery, workshop, factory, or manufacturing establishment, and other places in which goods are produced or held for interstate commerce; to inspect the certificates of age kept on file, time records and such other records of the producer or manufacturer as may aid in the enforcement of the act; to have access to freight bills, shippers' receipts, or other records of shipments in interstate or foreign commerce kept by railroads, express companies, steamship lines, or other transportation companies so far as they may aid in the enforcement of the act.

Regulation 10. Obstructing inspection.

SECTION 1. It shall be the duty of a producer or manufacturer to produce for examination by an inspector the certificates of age kept on file and any child in the employ of a manufacturer or producer whom the inspector may ask to see. Concealing or preventing or attempting to conceal or prevent a child from appearing before an inspector or being examined by him or hindering or delaying in any way an inspector in the performance of his duties shall be considered an obstruction of inspection within the meaning of section 5.

SEC. 2. No owner, manager, or other person in charge of premises or records shall be subject to prosecution for obstruction of inspection if the inspector shall refuse upon request to submit his identification card for examination by such owner, manager, or other person.

Regulation 11. Removal.

Withdrawal for any purpose of an article or commodity from the place where it was manufactured or produced constitutes a removal thereof within the meaning of the act; and the 30-day period within which employment of children contrary to the standards prescribed in section 1 of the act results in prohibiting shipment in interstate or foreign commerce shall be computed from that time.

Regulation 12. Guaranty.

SECTION 1. A guaranty to protect a dealer from prosecution under section 5 of the act shall be signed by and contain the name and address of the manufacturer or producer; it shall be specific, covering the particular goods shipped or delivered for shipment or transportation, and shall not be a general guaranty covering all goods manufactured or produced or to be manufactured or produced by the guarantor. It may be incorporated in or attached to or stamped or printed on the bill of sale, bill of lading, or other schedule that contains a list of the goods which the manufacturer or producer intends to guarantee.

SEC. 2. A dealer shipping goods from a State other than the State of manufacture or production does not require a guaranty in order to be protected from prosecution. (See sec. 6 of the act.)

SEC. 3. A guaranty substantially in accordance with the following forms will comply with the requirements of the act:

For products of mines or quarries—

(I or we), the undersigned, do hereby guarantee that the articles or commodities listed herein (or specify the same) were produced by (me or us) in a mine or quarry

in which within 30 days prior to removal of such product therefrom[1] no children under the age of 16 years were employed or permitted to work.

(Name and place of business of producer or manufacturer.)

(Date of removal.)

For products of a mill, cannery, workshop, factory, or manufacturing establishment—

(I or we), the undersigned, do hereby guarantee that the articles or commodities listed herein (or specify the same) were produced or manufactured by (me or us) in a (mill, cannery, workshop, factory, or manufacturing establishment) in which within 30 days prior to the removal of such product therefrom[1] no children under the age of 14 years were employed or permitted to work, nor children between the ages of 14 years and 16 years were employed or permitted to work more than eight hours in any day or more than six days in any week, or after the hour of 7 o'clock p. m. or before the hour of 6 o'clock a. m.

(Name and place of business of producer or manufacturer.)

(Date of removal.)

Regulation 13. Alteration and amendment of regulations.

These regulations may be altered or amended at any time without previous notice by the board as constituted in section 2 of the act.

[1] During the month of September, 1917, a manufacturer or producer may substitute for the clause "within 30 days prior to the removal therefrom" the clause "on and after September 1, 1917."

APPENDIX III.

FORMS USED IN CONNECTION WITH THE ISSUANCE OF FEDERAL CERTIFICATES OF AGE.

[The words in italics are as entered by hand on the blank forms, but all names and addresses are fictitious.]

FORM NO. 1.

C. L. 7
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR
Children's Bureau.

INFORMATION CARD.

February 8, 1919.
(Certificate expires)

Richmond (City or district) *Virginia* (State) *September 1, 1917.* (Date issued)

1. *Smith, Henry* (Name of child) *Feb. 8, 1903* (Mo., da., yr. of birth) *14* (Age) *Certificate of Physical Age* (Evidence of age)
2. *Richmond, Va.* (Birthplace) *W* (Color) *M* (Sex) *Clark St. School, Richmond, Va.* (School last attended) *6* (Grade or school year)
3. *Smith, George* (Name of parent or guardian) *227 High Street* (Address)

Henry Smith
(Signature of child)

4. Certificate refused—reason
   1. Under 14 years of age.
   2. 16 or 17 years of age.
   3. Unsatisfactory evidence of age.
   4. No evidence of age.

Bible Record
(Kind of evidence submitted)

August 25, 1917.
(Date of interview)

Mary Brown
(Issuing officer)

5.

FORM NO. 1 (REVERSE).

Certificate No.	Name and address of employer.	Industry.	Time worked.	Certificate suspended.	Disposition.
34756	*Borden Mfg. Co., Richmond, Va.*	*Cotton goods....*	Began *9/2/17* Ended *10/24/17*		
44564	*Columbia Knitting Co., Richmond, Va.*	*Knit goods.....*	Began *11/5/17* Ended *3/2/18*		
56892	*Borden Mfg. Co., Richmond, Va.*	*Cotton goods....*	Began *4/3/18* Ended		
.....	.....	.....	Began		
.....	.....	.....	Ended		
.....	.....	.....	Began		
.....	.....	.....	Ended		

FORM NO. 2.

C. L. 1
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR
Children's Bureau.

INTENTION TO EMPLOY.

Henry Smith.
(Name of child)
Borden Mfg. Co.
(Name of establishment)
Mfg. of cotton goods.
(Nature of business or industry)
Interstate.
(Engaged in interstate or foreign commerce)

The undersigned intends to employ the above-named child in accordance with the provisions of the United States child-labor act and the regulations for the enforcement of such act, upon receipt of a certificate showing the child is of legal age for employment. The undersigned further agrees to return the certificate of age to the issuing officer within three days after the child's employment terminates.

Arthur M. Hill.
(Signature of employer or authorized agent)

Date *August 25, 1917.*

18 Clark St., Richmond, Va.
(Address)

FORM NO. 3.

C. L. 9
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR
Children's Bureau

TRANSCRIPT OF BIRTH CERTIFICATE.

This certifies that, according to the records of this department.....
(Child's full name)
was born in .....on .....
(City or town and State) (Month, day, year)

In case no official record of the child's birth exists, the following form should be filled in:

This certifies that a search has been made of the records of birth of *Richmond, Va.*,
(City, town, or county)
and the name of *Henry Smith*, said to have been born there on *February 8, 1903*, has
(Name of child) (Month, day, year)
not been found.

Charles Talcott, Registrar.
(Name and title)

Date, *August 27, 1917.*

Vital Statistics, Richmond, Va.
(Department) (City or town and State)

Statements on this form to be signed by registrar, assistant registrar, or other official having authority to search official birth-registration records. If the State has a printed form for certifying to transcripts of birth records, that form may be used if desired.

FORM NO. 4.

C. L. 10
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR
Children's Bureau

TRANSCRIPT OF BAPTISMAL CERTIFICATE.

This certifies that, according to the records of this church, ...
(Child's full name)
was born in .... on .....
(Birthplace) (Month, day, year)
and was baptized on ..... and was aged ..... on that date.
(Month, day, year) (Days, weeks, etc.)

In case no record of the child's baptism exists the following form should be filled in:

This certifies that no record is made of the baptism of *Henry Smith* in the books of
(Name of child)
this church.

George Parsons,
(Minister or priest)
High St. Methodist Church, 215 High St.,
(Corporate name of church) (Address)

[OFFICIAL SEAL.]

Richmond, Va., August 28, 1917.
(City or town and State) (Date)

FORM NO. 5.

C. L. 14
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR
Children's Bureau

PARENT'S STATEMENT.

Richmond, Va., September 1, 1917.
(City or county and State) (Date)

To the Chief of Children's Bureau, Washington, D. C.:

I, the undersigned, hereby allege that I am the *Parent* of *Henry Smith*, residing
(Parent or guardian) (Name of child)
at *227 High St.*, and that the said child was born in *Richmond, Virginia*, on
(City, county, and State)
February 8, 1903, and that I have been unable to secure documentary proof of the
(Month, day, year of birth)
child's age as enumerated in Regulation 2 of the Rules and Regulations for the enforcement of the United States child-labor act, namely: (a) Birth certificate; (b) baptismal certificate; (c) other satisfactory documentary evidence.

George Smith,
(Parent or guardian)

Any person who knowingly makes a false statement or presents false evidence in connection with the application for a certificate of age is liable to a penalty of not more than $200 for each offense prior to the first conviction, and to not more than $1,000 nor less than $100, or by imprisonment for not more than three months, or by both such fine and imprisonment for each offense subsequent to the first conviction.

FORM NO. 6.

C. L. 13
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR
Children's Bureau

PHYSICIAN'S CERTIFICATE OF AGE.

Richmond, Henrico Co., Va., September 1, 1917.
(City or town, county, State) (Date)

This certifies that I have examined *Henry Smith* and submit the following report:
(Name of child)

(1) *57½* in., (2) *88* lbs., (3) ..... (4) *14* yrs.,
(Height) (Weight) (Other evidence of physical age) (Physical age)

(5) *None.* Physician *James Tully.* (6) *County physician.*
(Evidence of disease) (Signature) (Official position)

To the Doctor:

(7) A child must be 56 inches in height and weigh 80 pounds to be certified as having reached the physical age of 14 years; and must be 57 inches in height and weigh 85 pounds to be certified as having reached the physical age of 16 years. (See reverse of this blank for exceptions to this rule.)

(8) Physician signing must be a public-health or a public-school physician.

See reverse for directions to examining physician.

(OVER)

FORM NO. 6 (REVERSE).

DIRECTIONS TO EXAMINING PHYSICIAN.

1. Height should be recorded to the nearest quarter inch. Measurements should be taken with the child wearing shoes.

2. Weight should be recorded to the nearest quarter of a pound. The child should be weighed in clothing equivalent to ordinary winter indoor clothing. Hats and outside coats should be removed. Care should be exercised that no heavy objects are carried in the clothing in order to increase the apparent weight.

3. *Other evidence of physical age.*—Enter here any other evidence besides the height and weight in support of the opinion of the physician as to the physical age of the child.

4. *Physical age.*—Enter here the apparent age of the child in the opinion of the physician.

5. *Evidence of disease.*—Enter here any evidence of disease found on physical examination, such as malnutrition, defective teeth, enlarged tonsils, tuberculosis, etc.

If the child is apparently in good health and all organs are normal enter here: *None.*

6. *Official position.*—Enter here title of physician, as, for instance: "County health officer," "School physician employed by board of education," etc.

7. The minimum standards given on the face of the certificate have been fixed after consideration of the average height and weight of many thousands of children in various parts of the United States. The minimum standards given are far below the average, yet a few children of 14 and 16 who are naturally very short and who are yet normal may fall below these standards. Therefore the following EXCEPTION to the rule given on the face of the certificate may be made:

Exception.—When in the opinion of the examining physician the child is 14 or 16 years of age, and after a thorough physical examination the child is found to be in good health and well nourished and all organs are found to be normal, the child may be certified as being 14 or 16 years of age although falling slightly below the standard given on the face of the certificate. But in no case may a child be certified as 14 years of age who is less than 54 inches in height or weighs less than 75 pounds; nor may any child be certified as 16 years of age who is less than 56 inches in height and weighs less than 80 pounds.

FORM NO. 7.

C. L. 11
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR
Children's Bureau

SCHOOL RECORD OF AGE.

This certifies that the school register of *Clark St. School* of *Richmond, Va.*, contains
(School) (City or district and State)
the record of the school attendance of *Henry Smith* in the *3d District*, and shows that
(Full name of child) (City or district)
the age of said child on *September 15, 1912*, was *9* and *7*.
(Date of entrance) (Years) (Months)

Exact date of child's birth as shown by records of school *February 8, 1903*.
(Month, day, year)

Anna Rogers, Principal,
(Principal or chief executive officer)
Richmond 3d District.
(City or district)

Date, *August 28, 1917*.

FORM NO. 8.

C. L. 6
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR
Children's Bureau

34756
(No. of certificate)

NOTICE OF COMMENCEMENT OF EMPLOYMENT.

Notice is hereby given that *Henry Smith* commenced employment on *September 2*,
(Name of child) (Date)
1917.

Borden Mfg. Co.,
(Firm name)
Arthur M. Hill,
(Signature of employer or authorized agent)
Richmond, Va.
(Address)

To the employer: This card should be detached, filled out, and mailed (no postage required) as soon as the child begins employment.

(OVER)

C. L. 6a
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR
Children's Bureau

34756
(No. of certificate)

CERTIFICATE OF AGE.

1. *Henry Smith.* 2. *Feb. 8, 1903.* 3. *Richmond, Va.* 4. *Henry Smith.* 5. *White.*
(Name of child) (Mo., day, yr. of birth) (Birthplace) (Signature of child) (Color)
6. *Male.* 7. *George Smith.* 8. *227 High Street.* 9. *Borden Mfg. Co., 18 Clark Street.*
(Sex) (Name of parent or guardian) (Address) (Name of employer) (Address)
10. I hereby certify that I have examined and approved the *Certificate of Physical Age* of
(Documentary evidence of age)
the above-named child and have issued this certificate in accordance with the regulations of the United States child-labor act. 11. *Mary Brown, Washington, D. C.* 12.
(Signature of issuing officer) (Address)

Employment terminated *10/24/17*. Date of issue, *Sept. 1, 1917*.

This certificate should be returned to the issuing officer upon termination of child's employment. (OVER)

FORM NO. 8 (REVERSE).

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR
CHILDREN'S BUREAU
Washington
Return after five days

OFFICIAL BUSINESS

Penalty for private use $300

Mary Brown, Assistant Inspector, Washington, D. C.

NOTICE TO EMPLOYERS.

1. This certificate should be kept on file in the place of employment while the child is in your employ, in accordance with regulations authorized under section 5 of the United States child-labor act.

2. This certificate is to be returned to the issuing officer within three days after the child's employment terminates. If the child does not enter your employ, this certificate is to be returned to said officer within six days.

3. The United States child-labor act prohibits from shipment or delivery for shipment in interstate or foreign commerce any article or commodity the product of any mine or quarry in which, within 30 days prior to the removal of such product therefrom, children under 16 have been employed; or the shipment or delivery for shipment of any article or commodity the product of any mill, cannery, workshop, or manufacturing establishment in which, within 30 days prior to the removal of such product, children under 14 have been employed, or children between the ages of 14 and 16 have been employed more than 8 hours in any day, more than 6 days in any week, or before 6 a. m. or after 7 p. m.

4. The penalty for violation of the above provision or for refusal or obstruction of entry or inspection is a fine not more than $200 for each offense prior to the first conviction, and not more than $1,000 nor less than $100, or by imprisonment for not more than three months, or by both such fine and imprisonment, for each offense subsequent to the first conviction.

5. If any alterations appear to have been made on this form it should be sent to the Child Labor Division, Children's Bureau, Washington, D. C.

6. Copies of the act and of the rules and regulations will be furnished, on request, by the Child Labor Division, Children's Bureau, Washington, D. C.

(OVER.)

FORM NO. 9.

C. L. 8
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR
Children's Bureau

IDENTIFICATION CARD.

Certificate No. *34756*, issued *September 1, 1917*
To work for *Borden Mfg. Co.*
(Firm name of employer)
Address *Richmond, Henrico, Virginia, 18 Clark St.*
(City) (County) (State) (Street and number)
To *Henry Smith*
(Full name of child)
Address *Richmond, Henrico, Virginia, 227 High St.*
(City) (County) (State) (Street and number)

Mary Brown, Assistant Inspector
(Issuing officer—Name and title)
Washington, D. C.
(Address)

The child should keep this card

FORM NO. 10.

C. L. 2
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR
Children's Bureau

REPORT TO SCHOOL—AGE CERTIFICATE ISSUED.

Name of child *Smith, Henry.* Certificate No. *34756*
(Surname first)
227 High St., Richmond, Va.
(Address)
Grade or school year *6.*
Date of birth *February 8, 1903.*
Date of issue *September 1, 1917*

Mary Brown, Asst. Inspector.
(Issuing officer—Name and title)
Washington, D. C.
(Address)

FORM NO. 11.

C. L. 17
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR
Children's Bureau

DAILY REPORT OF CERTIFICATES ISSUED.

Report of *Mary Brown, Assistant Inspector, October 22, 1917.*
(Name and title of issuing officer) (Week ending)

Washington, D. C.
(Address)

Date.		Place.	Applications received for certificates of age.			Disposition of applications.			
							Certificates.		
Month.	Day.		Total received.	First applications.	Reapplications on continued cases.	Total disposed of.	Issued.	Refused.	Applications continued.
Oct.	*17*	*Richmond*	*40*	*30*	*10*	*25*	*20*	*5*	*15*
	18	*Richmond*	*45*	*33*	*12*	*26*	*19*	*7*	*19*
	19	*Richmond*	*38*	*30*	*8*	*27*	*23*	*4*	*11*
	20	*Petersburg*	*35*	*20*	*15*	*22*	*19*	*3*	*13*
	21	*Petersburg*	*24*	*18*	*6*	*18*	*15*	*3*	*6*
	22	*Richmond*	*29*	*17*	*12*	*20*	*18*	*2*	*9*
		Total for week	*211*	*148*	*63*	*138*	*114*	*24*	*73*

Entries must be made daily and cards for preceding week mailed to Washington office every Monday.

FORM NO. 12.

C. L. 12
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR
Children's Bureau

NOTICE OF SUSPENSION OF CERTIFICATE.

Richmond, Virginia, January 3, 1917.
(City or town and State) (Date)

Certificate No. *66782*, issued to *Hillside Manufacturing Co.*, under authority
(Name of employer)
of {United States child-labor act / The State of.....} and bearing the name of *Clara Harmon*, is hereby
(Name of child)
suspended and will not protect against prosecution under section 5 of the United States child-labor act. Notice of the revocation or declaration of the validity of such certificate in accordance with section 5 of the United States child-labor act will be made later.

John Harrington.
(Inspector)

Copies of this notice are to be mailed (1) to the child whose certificate is suspended, (2) to the officer issuing the certificate, and (3) to the Children's Bureau, Washington, D. C.

FORM NO. 13.

C. L. 5
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR
Children's Bureau

NOTICE OF VETO OF SUSPENSION.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 15, 1917.*
(Date)

The suspension on *January 3, 1918*, of certificate No. *66782*, issued to *Hillside Mfg.*
(Date) (Name of employer)
Co., under authority of {The United States child-labor act / The State of.....} and bearing the name of
Clara Harmon, is hereby VETOED.
(Name of child)

Grace Abbott,
Director Child-Labor Division.

According to Regulation 5, if a new certificate can not be obtained upon application to the issuing officer, this notice filed with the suspended certificate will protect the employer against prosecution under section 5 of the United States child-labor act.

FORM NO. 14.

C. L. 3
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR
Children's Bureau

NOTICE OF REVOCATION OF CERTIFICATE.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 6, 1918.*
(Date)

Certificate No. *3892*, issued to *Northern Iron Foundry*, under authority of
(Name of employer)

{United States child-labor act / The State of.....} and bearing the name of *William Bridgeman*, is hereby
(Name of child)

REVOKED. Employers are hereby warned against the acceptance of the above-named certificate under section 5 of the United States child-labor act.

Grace Abbott,
Director Child-Labor Division.

Upon receipt of this notice employers are requested to return the designated certificate to the Children's Bureau, Washington, D. C., in inclosed franked envelope, which requires no postage.

INDEX